KASHMIR AFFAIRS

KASHMIR AFFAIRS

KASHMIR AFFAIRS

Haji WALI MUHAMMAD DOGAR
M.A.

DOGAR BROTHERS
STANDARD PUBLISHERS

Head Office :
Dogar Abad, Santnagar, Lahore

PAKISTAN

Branch Office :
17-Urdu Bazar, Lahore

Second Edition **1971** **Price : Rs. 4.00**

Publishers :

Dogar Brothers,
Standard Publishers,
Dogar Abad, Santnagar,
Lahore, Pakistan.

First Edition ... 1970
Second Edition ... 1971

Printed at :

The Zahid Iqbal Printing Press,
Dogar Abad, Sant Nagar,
Lahore, Pakistan.

PREFECE

Preface To The Second Edilion

The book "Kashmir Affairs" have been recast, enlarged and brought up-to-date. Valuable additions and alterations have been made so as to keep readers abreast of new trends. It is confidently hoped that the book will meet the requirements of the people. Any suggestions for the improvement of the book will be welcome.

WALI MUHAMMAD DOGAR

Preface To The Second Edition

The book "Kashmir Affairs" presents the glimpse of affairs that have been engineered in the "Muslim Kashmir" by the Hindu *Banias* of India and her foreign supporters including America and her parasite Israil. Most of the true inhabitants of this Muslim land have been ousted and made alien to their own lands by the combined aggressive plans of the Hindus, the Christans, the Jews and the Communists.

The book also outlines the onslaughts of atrocities of the Hindus of India on the innocent Muslim Kashmiris. The Indian Hindus' plans of butchering the Kashmiri Muslims is a chain of campaign which they have let loose on the innocent Muslims of India. One wonders to read and know about the tyrannies of the Indian Hindus upon the very Muslims of Kashmir and India under whom they

have lived for about a thousand years and have all along been fairly treated by them. And even now the Hindus and other minorities are fairly treated under the tenets of Islam by the Muslims in Pakistan. The Muslim administrations have extended most liberal rights to the Hindus in Pakistan and there is no instance of aggression on them.

Then the book depicts the *Jihad* campaigns of the Kashmiri Muslims for the liberation of their homeland from the clutches of the Hindu tyrants and *goondas* as contained in U.N. Resolutions of 1948 and 1965 etc. The world press supports the liberation of Kashmir. The book also gives details of *Al-Mujahid* Movement and other movements for the liberation of Kashmir.

The Kashmiri Muslim *Mujahid's Jihad* campaigns for the liberation of their mother land is akin to the Jihad Movements of the Palestinian *Mujahids*, Middle-East Muslims, Cyprus Muslims, Philippine Mulims, etc. The Mulims, all over the world are fighting for the liberation of their usurped lands and thus fighting for the cause of Allah.

The Quran (2 : 190-191) exhorts the Muslims of the world thus : "And fight in the cause of Allah against those who fight against you, but do not transgress. Surely, Allah does not love the transgressors. And kill them wherever you meet them and drive them out from where they have driven you out". Under the commands of the Quran. the driving out power of the Kashmiri Muslims is accelerating day by day. and the day, *Insha-Aallah*, is not far off, when the Muslims who have been rightful administrators of India for centuries on end, and who are its lawful inheritors, will once more drive out the Hindu usurpers from Kashmir in the near future.

In its Chapter 1, the book takes up "General" view of Jammu and Kashmir; in its Chapter 2 it takes up "Historical View" of the country; while in its Chapter 4, it describes "First Jihad Campaign for Liberation of Kashmir", while in its Chapter 5 it inclines towards describing "Toward Second

Jihad Campaign for Liberation of Kashmir", its Chapter 6 describes "Second Jihad Campaign Events", its Chapter 7 relates about "World Press Support For Leberation of Kashmir"; its Chapter 8 takes up "Kashmir Case And the United Nations" and its Chapter 9 describes "*Al-Mujahid Tehrik* For Liberation of Kashmir".

The book will meet the demand of condidates appearing in various competitive examinations such as CSSP (Central Superior Services of Pakistan) Examination, P.C.S. (Provincial Civil Service) Examination, P. M. A (Pakistan Military Academy), ISSB (Inter-Services Selection Boards) and other civil and Military competitive and promotion examinations as well as students taking up M.A. in International Relations and Journalism. It also takes the interest of common man desirous of keeping himself in tune with the current affairs of the world. It also arouses the interest of a common Muslim who finds how his lands are usurped and how he is humiliated at the combined hands of the non-Muslims. The plight of the ousted Kashmiris and the India-Held Kashmiris brings to the mind of a Muslim, a tale of chain of miseries that he faces in Junagarh, Hyderabad (Deccan), in India at large, the Middle East, Palestine, Cyprus, Sabah, etc. Then he finds to his satisfaction that akin to his Muslim brethren of the world who have stood up to efface the traces of foreign aggression on their lands, the Kashmiri *Mujahid* has also embarked on a grand campaign of Jihad against the Hindu *Bania* and her supporters for the self-determination as sponsored many times by the American-controlled United Nations. Allah be praised for the help which He is extending to the helpless Muslims of Kashmir for regaining their usurped sovereignty. The time, by Allah's grace, is not far off when the Muslims of Kashmir will be raised again to their past glory, and will be the masters and the rulers of their own homeland, Kashmir.

The glad tidings of victory for the Muslims of the whole world for all the times is announced by Allah in Quran 16:13 in these words:"And He well bestow another

favour which you love, help from Allah and a near victory. So convey glad tidings to the Muslims (of the whole world for all times."

Suggestions for improvements in the book will be welcome.

WALI MOHAMMAD DOGAR

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Muslims of the world are made to suffer at the combined hand of the Christian world, the Jews, the Hindus, Communists, etc. The cause of all this trouble is that Islam negates the false man-made laws and man-made religions of the world. Throughout the ages, since Prophet Adam (peace be upon him), Islam has been guiding the whole mankind for success both in this world and the Hereafter. But some mankind, hankering after small worldly gains, have been displaying their rebellious character against Allah, and have been straying from His Right Path of Islam. Allah out of His mercy and for the benefit of His mankind, has been revealing Books and raising Prophets for their guidance. He has revealed more or less 104 Books and have raised more or less 1,24,000 or 1,45,000 Prophets for the guidance of His mankind. Allah is determined to take the message of Islam to every nook and corner of the world in spite of the resistance of the *Kafirs* (disbelievers), ***Mushriks*** etc. Allah has referred to this fact in Quran 9 : 32-33 thus : "They desire to extinguish the light of Allah with their mouths ; but Allah will permit nothing except that He will perfect His light though the disbelievers may dislike it. Allah has sent His ***Rasul*** (Muhammad) with guidance and the religion of truth, so that He may make it prevail over every other (man-made) religion, even though ***Mushriks*** (Associators or idolaters) may dislike it". Again Allah in Quran 8:8 says : "That He might establish the truth (*i.e.* Islam) and bring to nothing that which is false, although the guilty might dislike it."

Islam is based on the nature of man. It solves, in the most effective way, all the problems of the human beings in the fields of spiritual, cultural, economic, social, etc. Its system of inheritance law extending half the share to

women-folk, *Zakat*, *Sadaqat*, *Charity* etc., places society on the most sound footing.

The defective systems of imperialism which is mostly adopted by the Christian world, and the prevailing communist system, which is adopted by the Communist world, are most disturbing and harmful to the balanced system of Islam, which negates both of them in an effective manner. The masses of the imperialist countries are not satisfied with the Christian inheritance law which snatches away the rights of all the members of a family and places it at the disposal of a single man—the eldest son. The whole women-folk is also deprived of the share of property of her parents in the Christian law, although they may pay only a lip service to them. Hence the wronged masses of the Christian world incline towards the balanced Islamic law of inheritance which extends its hand of co-operation towards the whole mankind. On the other hand, the recent man-coined system of Communism and Socialism which is the severest kind of dictatorship, totally negates the rights of inheritance for mankind. It has totally shattered the most cherished personality of man by depriving him of his right to property. This system has totally slaughtered the independent character of man and has totally changed these countries into *begar* (بیگار) camps. One dreads to know the plight of both *begari* junta and the dictators of these *begari* countries. The "iron-curtain" Governments of these countries are in the hands of a few dictators who themselves stand dreadful of the continuous and swift currents of purges. In a very brief time it is a long tale of murders, killings, and a lot of other dreadful scenes. The man who has been created by Allah with the "best faculties of mental and physical" (Al-Quran 25 : 4) cannot be dragged for long on the unnatural system In the shortest history of this dictatorial system, the junta of those countries have rebelled against the total negation of property as a result of which all the Communist countries with the exception of China have restored some property rights to the people. The Communist China is clamouring day in and day out against the "revisionist action" of these

Communist countries. But nobody cares for her unlawful cries as the extension of even limited property rights have yielded most encouraging prospects. Thus all the Communist countries are prolonging their dictatorships by indirectly adopting the inheritance law of Islam.

The masses of both blocs of Imperialism and Communism favour the natural religion of mankind—Islam which restores balanced life to them. But only a few dictators of both of these blocs, who somehow or other manage to overpower the governments of these countries, are very dreadful of the balanced system of Islam. Their ideologies may be poles apart; one may claim that there is no God at all, while the other may say that there is Trinity (three Gods *viz* God, Isa and Maryam); but they will combine together and will act together in opposing Islam—the upholder of the balanced system of mankind and the upholder of One God. They will think over plans for weakening Islam and its followers—the Muslims. They will unite their hands to weaken the cause of Islam and the Muslims. They will join hands in implanting Israel in the very heart of the Muslim world. They will totally uproot the Palestine Muslims who have been masters of their country for more than 13 centuries and will implant the foreigner Israelis in it. They will combine to cause harm to the Muslims of Cyprus, Sabah, Kashmir, etc. In order to weaken the Muslim power, they will intrigue with India to snatch away Hyderabad, Junagarh, and several other possessions of the Muslims. They will intrigue with the Hindus to snatch away "Muslim Kashmir" which, with the utmost efforts of the Qaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah and the Muslim nation, was once made part of Pakistan. And the very letter of "K" in the word "Pakistan" represents "Kashmir". They will ceck the hand of the Kashmiri Muslims and those of Pakistani Muslims whenever they intended to punish even the aggressive Hindus of India. The United Nations will at once step in to save India from the Pakistani Muslims when she failed to crush Pakistan in her aggressive war against Pakistan. They will become warm allies in harming the cause of Islam and the Muslim world in numerous other ways and forms. But in spite of

the mischievous intrigues of the world powers, the Muslims world has become more strong. They have relieved themselves and are ever relieving themselves for their weaknesses. They have gathered under the banner of Islam and are uniting themselves in a single rope as commanded by Allah in Quran 3:103 which reads : "And hold fast altogether by the rope of Allah, and be not divided". Under the Islamic spirit they are gathering at "Muslim Summits" to solve their individual and collective problems through the Muslims and through other numerous ways. Allah is determined to take the message of Islam to every nook and corner of the world for relieving His mankind from the false and misleading man-made laws and man-coined religions of the world. By His grace, the Muslims shall always stand victorious in the world. Allah invites the attention of the whole mankind towards this fact in the Quran 21:41 in these words: "Do they (opponents of Islam) not see that We are visiting the land, reducing it from its outlying borders? Can they even then be victors?"

The problem of the Kashmir case which is pending unsolved for more than 23 years is a tale of hardships and broken promises.

The Kashmir problem is a long tale of miseries, cruelties and hardships. Like the Palestinian Muslims, the Kashmiri Muslims have been uprooted from their motherland. The Big Powers are interested in weakening the cause of the Kashmir Muslims and they are causing it to linger on for more than two decades.

But the Kashmiri Muslims will not sit idle. They have waged *Jihad* campaigns for the liberation of their homeland. The Kashmiris of Held-Kashmir under the leadership of *Sher-i-Kashmir*, Haji Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah, and the Kashmiris of Azad Kashmir, under the leadership of President Abdul Qayyum Khan, are accelerating *Mujahid* Movement for the liberation of their motherland from the clutches of the Hindus and their foreign supporters. They are determined to wage war on the pattern

enjoined upon them by Allah both on a "collective" and "individual (guerilla) basis". For resorting to this sort of fighting they refer to Quran 4 : 71 which commands them thus : " O Muslims ! take your precautions; then either go forth in separate (guerilla) parties or go forth all together." They have witnessed that their Algerian brethren have succeeded in launching this guerilla warfare. They also see that their Palestinian and Middle Eastern brethren are pursuing the same guerilla warfare pattern for the liberation of their usurped lands. The day of victory of the Kashmiri Muslims, by Allah's grace, is not far off. Because whenever the Muslims unite among themselves against their own enemies as well as the enemies of Allah, then He supports them to victory. The Quran approves this fact in 61:13 in these words:

"And He will bestow another favour which you love, help from Allah and a near victory. So convey glad tidings to the Muslims".

CHAPTER 1
GENERAL

Jammu. Jammu is the winter capital of the Jammu and Kashmir State, and is also capital of its Province of Jammu. It lies on the Tawi River, a tributory of the Chenab, 95 miles south of Srinagar. The town stands upon the right bank of the river, the fort overhangs the left bank at a height of 150 feet above the stream. The city was the seat of a Rajput dynasty. After conquest by Sikhs, it became part of Maharaja Ranjit Singh's dominions. After his death, it was acquired by Gulab Singh as the nucleus of his dominions, to which the British added Kashmir in 1846. There is a railway, no longer used, to Sialkot. India has, for the time being, unlawfully, treacherously and forcibly usurped Jammu, but the leaders of the Held-State of Jammu and Kashmir, and the leaders of Azad Kashmir territory, are on the road to liberate it from the clutches of the coward *Bannias* of India. There are *Mujahid* movements of the Kashmir Muslims, both in the Hindu-Held Valley and Azad Kashmir to liberate their homeland. The time is, *Insha-Allah*, not far off, when by Allah's grace, the overwhelming majority of the Kashmiri Muslims will liberate their homeland from the Hindu usurpers.

Jammu and Kashmir. Jammu and Kashmir was one of the largest princely States of India for a century from 1846 to 1947. Since 1947, when India was divided into the dominions of Pakistan and India, possession of some part of the State has been forcibly usurped by India. In Jammu, there are some Dogras and Sikhs, which have been imported from other parts of India. There are also some Buddhists in Ladakh. In the State of Jammu and Kashmir there is overwhelming majority of the Muslims. On this account, the Muslims of the State decided to join Pakistan.

The area of Jammu and Kashmir is 85,861 square miles. It is bounded on the west by Afghanistan, on the north by the Sinkiang-Uigur Autonomous Region of China, on the north-east by Tibet. The population of Jammu and Kashmir, according to 1961 census was 3,560,976.

Kashmir, with its open valley, or "happy valley", well-known for its beauty since Muslim times (Mughal Times), and with its surrounding hills and valleys, *viz* the Liddar and the Sind, is also a tourist and pleasure resort.

Srinagar is the summer capital of the Valley, which is at an altitude of 5,200 feet, and Jammu is the winter capital which is at the altitude of 1,030 feet. The town of Jammu lies at the southern foot of the Himalayas at the edge of the Punjab plain.

Two nation Theory. In a speech Quaid-e-Azam, Mohammad Ali Jinnah, dispelled the idea of oneness of the Indian nation :

> "It is extremely difficult to appreciate why our Hindu friends fail to understand the real nature of Islam and Hinduism. They are not religions in the strict sense of the word, but are, in fact, different and distinct social orders, and, it is a dream that the Hindus and Muslims can ever evolve a common nationality, and this misconception of one Indian nation, has gone far beyond the limits and is the cause of most of our troubles, and will lead India to destruction, if we fail to revise our notions in time. The Hindus and Muslims belong to two different religious philosophies, social customs, literatures. They neither intermarry, nor interdine and, indeed, they belong to two different civilizations, which are based mainly on conflicting ideas and conception".

The real cause of all the bitterness and bloodshed, all the venomed speech, the recalcitrance and the suspicion that have characterized the Kashmir dispute, is uncompromising, rather uncompromisable struggle of two ways of life,

two concepts of political organization, two scales of values, two spiritual attitudes, that find themselves locked in deadly conflict, a conflict in which Kashmir has become both symbol and battleground. In case, however, the struggle for Kashmir were a struggle for national resources, or for manpower, or for strategic position, or for any other gain for which nations usually, contest, it might well have been solved long ago, it would not have constituted for the entire subcontinent the menace that today it remains.

The Award of Gurdaspur district to India was most unreasonable. In dividing India into Pakistan and Bharat, the basic unit was the district. According to 1941 census Gurdaspur was a Muslim-majority district. If this district had gone to Pakistan, there would have been no Kashmir dispute. In this connection Lord Birdwood observed: "The Gurdaspur district consists of four tehsils *viz.*, Batala, Shakargarh, Gurdaspur itself and Pathankot. Of course, the first three had Muslim majorities and only the Pathankot tehsil had a Hindu majority. Had therefore the three Muslim tehsils gone to Pakistan, the maintenance of Indian forces within Kashmir would still have presented a grave problem for the Indian commanders, for the railhead at Pathankot is fed through the middle of the Gurdaspur tehsil. It was Radcliffe's Award to India of the Gurdaspur and Batala tehsils with Muslim majorities which rendered possible the maintenance of an Indian force in Jammu, based on Pathankot as railhead and which enabled India to consolidate her defences southwards all the way from Uri to the Pakistan border".

The Award of the Gurdaspur district to India pained Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah much. On October 30, 1947 he said, "We have been the victims of a deep-laid and well-planned conspiracy, executed with utter disregard of the elementary principles of honesty, chivalry and honour". The Award of the Boundary Commission was described as "unjust, incomprehensible and even perverse". "We have been squeezed inasmuch as it was possible". He deplored the systematic massacre of innocent defenceless Kashmiri

Muslims of Baltistan, polygamous and of mixed race and culture. These are replaced in Hunza, Nagar, and the agency principalities by races loosely grouped as Dards, speaking a number of Shin and other dialects, quite different from Kashmiri, Balti or Ladakhi.

Larger areas of eastern Ladakh, especially north of the upper Indus, are uninhibited. Elsewhere in Ladakh, where there are permanent settlements in the valleys, the villages are often oases on alluvial fans, splashes of green in an otherwise story mountain desert, irrigated by rough water channels fed by glacier streams or permanent snow, and lined with poplars. High in the mountains summer huts and grazing grounds are often abandoned when winter cold and snow drive herdsmen to lower altitudes.

Language. The people of Jammu and Kashmir use many languages and dialects *viz.*, the Kashmiri language, Dardic language, Burushaski language, etc.

Kashmiri language. The proper name of Kashmiri language is *Kasmiri.* It is spoken by the most population of the valley and the adjoining hills. By origin, it is the most southern member of the Dard group of the so-called Dardic languages.

The Kashmiri language has lost most of its original Dardic character, and is now a mixed form of speech. Kashmiri has few dialects. The only important varieties are Kishtwari, spoken in the hills south-west of Kashmir and Pogul and Rambani of the hills south of the Banihal pass.

The two main features are the numerous epenthetic changes of vowels and consonants, and the employment of pronominal suffixes. In both cases the phenomena are perfectly plain, cause and effect being presented in the complicated systems of declension and conjugation. The Indo-Aryan languages proper, long ago passed through this stage and a study of the Kashmiri language explains a number of troubles experienced by the student of Indo-Aryan vernaculars. The vocabulary of Kashmiri is mixed.

At its basis it has a large number of words which are also used in the neighbouring Shina.

Administration. The original state comprised of the Provinces of Jammu, Kashmir and the border *States.* Jammu, with Poonch was divided into the districts of Jammu, Kathua, Udhampur, Mirpur and Reasi. Kashmir was divided into the districts of Anantnag, Baramulla, Astor, Muzaffarabad and Srinagar. The border states are Ladakh, Baltistan, and the Gilgit Agency which consist of the Gilgit and Astor Sub-Divisions, the political districts of Ghizar, Punyal (Punjal), Ashkuman and Yasin, the states of Hunza and Nagar and the Sub-Agency of Chilas. Muzaffarabad, Ladakh and part of Mirpur and Poonch comprise the State of Azad Kashmir, while Baltistan and Gilgit Agency are protected and administered by Pakistan. Jammu, Srinagar, Kathua, Udhampur, Reasi, Anantnag, Baramulla, etc. are forcibly usurped by India at the instigation and help of the foreign powers.

Azad Kashmir. Muslims—the lawful owners of this Valley, rose up against the tyrant Sikh ruler and established their independent Government under the name of "Azad Kashmir" in October, 1947, with their headquarters at the town of Muzaffarabad. It is under a President who is assisted by a State Council of 12 members. The *State* has its own High Court. In its land reforms, the Government has abolished all types of Jagir.

In the State of Azad Kashmir, education at its lower stages is free and fee concessions are extended at the higher stages. There is a University and many Colleges. There are several hospitals and dispensaries and first-aid posts. The Kashmiri Muslims of Azad Kashmir are on the way to liberate their homeland which is held by India. They say that *Jehad* is the only way to settle the long-outstanding dispute with American-backed and Israeli-backed India, once for all. They say that they were badly mistaken that this tangle could be solved through political parleys or through the American-controlled United Nations.

The President of All-Jammu and Kashmir Muslim

Conference and Chief of *Al-Mujahid* Force at a public meeting, held on April 13, 1970, told the gathering that at least two lakh youngmen would be recruited to *Al-Mujahid* force. He said that this sacred war had to be fought and won by Allah's grace. Sardar Abdul Qayyum has said that the problem of Indian-Held Kashmir is more difficult than the Palestine, Cyprus (Qabrus) and Vietnam issues. He often reiterates that Kashmir can be liberated only through guerilla warfare. He said that the fate of the Indian forces in Held-Kashmir would be the same as that of the American forces in Vietnam.

Gilgit Agency, Ladakh and Baltistan. They are administered by the Government of Pakistan, through Political agents. These areas are governed as separate units because of the difficult mountain terrain and the lack of communications between them. Gilgit town is the headquarters of the Gilgit Agency and Skardu that of Balistan. There are many primary and middle schools in this area. There are also many hospitals, dispensaries and first-aid posts in this area.

Indian-Held Kashmir. The Kashmiri Muslims' land of Jammu, Srinagar, Kathua, Udhampur, Reasi, Baramulla and part of Mirpur and Poonch, has been aggressively confiscated by India. It has been unlawfully placed under Indian Government on January 26, 1957. It has a High Court and many educational institutions. There have been frequent uprisings of the Kashmiri Muslims against India for the unlawful usurption of their country. Haji Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah, Afzal Beg, and other leaders, students and people of the India-Held Kashmir are perpetually endeavouring to liberate their homeland from the clutches of aggressive India. They are ever stiffening their *Jihad* movements for regaining their country.

The Economy. There are no major industries outside the Province of Kashmir. The Province has well-developed forest resources *viz.* spruce, blue pine, deodar, etc. in the mountains. The fruit includes apples, pears, quinces, apricots, peaches, strawberries, raspberries and mulberries, but the basic occupation is the cultivation of rice, maize

(corn), barley, rape, mustard and linseed. There is some animal husbandry, large flocks of sheep, goats, yaks and ponies being taken to upland pastures in summer. Good quality wool is woven into cloth (*putto*), the finest being *pashima* from which shawls are made. Carpets are also hand produced using indegenous products. Sericulture dates and mulberry trees are widely grown. The cultivation of saffron (*crocus sativus*) noted for its yellow dye and its use as a food flavouring, is an ancient industry. Hydro-electricity was introduced about 1910 generated in a power station near Rampur in the Jhelum gorge, water being channeled for 6 miles in a flume to give a head of 400 feet to the turbines. Tourist industry is another form of revenue. Leather and silver workers, carpenters, woodcovers and other craftsmen depend on tourist industry trade.

Communications. The disruption caused by the usurpation of the valley by India has been a tragedy for the territory. The cease-fire line cuts right across the country, and the Balti village of Skardu on the Indus is a Pakistani frontier post. The old Gilgit road is severed by the cease-fire line at the Burzil and Kamri passes and is no longer used. Baramulla is also a frontier town. The Jhelum valley road is no longer a road to Srinagar, which is now approached direct from Jammu by the Banihal route, greatly improved by tunnel through the Pir Panjal.

For three hundred years, the Mughal route into Kashmir was through Poonch and over the Pir Panjal pass (11,462 feet), which gives its name to the range. Only in 1880 was the Jhelum valley road constructed through the gorge between Muzaffarabad and Baramullah, later to be metalled, widened and made fit for motor vehicles. It became the direct road between Rawalpindi through Murree to Srinagar, though liable to be blocked by snow and landslides in winter and spring. In 1922, another road was opened over the Banihal pass (8,985 feet) to link Srinagar directly with Jammu and the railhead at Sialkot. From Srinagar two main routes lead to Central Asia : the Gilgit road *via* the Burzi pass (13,775 feet) and Astor,

constructed in 1890-91 and continued on through Hunza and over the Pamirs to Kashgar, or Sufu, in Sinkiang ; and the route, *via* the Sind valley and the Zoji La (11,578 feet), to Leh and on northward by the upper Shyok and Karakoram pass (18, 290 feet) to Yarkand. By 1960, the section between Srinagar and Leh, the capital of Ladakh, had been converted from a caravan track into a motorable road. The region of Suru, west of Zaskar, can also be reached from Jammu and the Warwan tributary of the Chenab by the Bat Kol pass (14,370 feet).

Chapter 2
HISTORICAL VIEW

There is no reliable historical record relating to ancient period.

Hindu period. The history of Kashmir is collected from four Sanskrit books. The "Rajatarangini", beginning with traditional history of very early times, comes down to the rule of Sangrama Deva which commenced in 1006; the second work, by Jonaraja, takes up the history in continuation and, entirely the Muslim period, gives an account of the reigns down to that of Zainul Ab-din who ascended the throne in 1420. Srivora carried on the record to the accession of Fateh Shah in 1489. The fourth work called "Rajavalipataka" by Projnia Bhatta, completes the history to the year 1586 when Kashmir was incorporated in the dominions of the Mughul Emperor Akbar. In the "Rajatarangini" it is stated that the valley of Kashmir was formerly a lake and that it was drained by the great *Rishi* or sage, Kasyupa, son of Marichi, son of Brahma, by cutting the gap in the hills at Baramulla. When Kashmir has been drained, he brought in the Brahmans to occupy it. In the 7th century Kashmir is said to have, by the Chinese traveller Hsuan Tasng, included Kabul and the Punjab and the hill region of Gandhara. At an early date the Sanskrit name of the country became Kashmir.

In the reign of Asoka, one of the Indian Buddhist mission, was sent to Kashmir and Gandhara. After his death Brahmanism revived. While Kashmir was under Kushan rule, Buddhism was to a great extent restored, though for many centuries, the two religions existed together in Kashmir, Hinduism predominating. In this Hindu-Buddhist era and especially between the 5th and

10th centuries A.D., the Hindu temples in Kashmir were built. In the 6th and 7th centuries Kashmir was visited by some of the Chinese Buddhist pilgrims to India. In the following century, the kings of Kashmir appear to have paid homage and tributes to China. Hindu kings continued to rule till about 1310, when a Muslim named Shams-Uddin established Muslim administration.

Kashmir under the Muslims. Kashmir remained under Muslims for 5 long centuries between 1310 to 1819.

For two centuries from 1310 to 1515, it remained under the local Muslim kings. For the next two centuries from 1515 to 1718, it remained a territory of the Mughal Empire. Then it passed on under the rule of the Afghan Government for another century from 1718 to 1819.

Kashmir under Sikhs. The Sikhs seized power from the Muslims and ruled Kashmir for a short period of 27 years only, from 1819 to 1846. Defeating the Afghan governor of Kashmir in 1819 Ranjit Singh, the Sikh ruler of the Punjab seized power, and laid foundation of Sikh rule in Kashmir which lasted up only to 1846.

It was after the Sikh conquest of Kashmir that Jammu came to importance under its ruler Gulab Singh, a Dogra Rajput, who extended his power over Kashmir thus laying the foundations of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. Gulab Singh was descended from Raja Ranjit Deo who ruled over Jammu in the middle of the 18th century. His descendent is traced back to Govanda, a well-known Kashmiri king mentioned in the "Rajatarangini". Previously Jammu had merely a local importance. After 1780 the rulers of Jammu had become tributory to the Sikhs of Lahore. Gulab Singh rose to prominence under Rangit Singh, who made him Raja of Jammu in 1820. After initial difficulties, he and his two brothers became rulers of the most of the country between Kashmir and the Punjab.

Kashmir sold to Gulab Singh. In the Afghan wars Gulab Singh allowed the British East India Company troops to pass through the Sikh territory, although Maharaja

Ranjit Singh, during his life-time, had refused the passage. Gulab Singh also extended help to the British troops when they returned from Afghanistan after their reverses. He had differences with the Sikh Court. On account of these differences, this traitor assumed neutral attitude in the first Sikh war of 1846 with the British Government. At the battle of Subraon, Gulab Singh played the role of a mediator. The British, true to their policy of "divide and rule" were determined to break the Sikh power in the Punjab. In Gulab Singh, who, had endeared himself to the British by his treacherous acts against the Sikh State, Sir Henry Lawrance, the Governor-General, found a traitor to shatter the Sikh State. The treaty of Lahore dated March 9, 1846 was concluded between the British and the Sikh State with the help of Gulab Singh, who was at that time the Prime Minister of the State. According to this treaty the Sikh Kingdom had to cede the State of Kashmir to the British in consideration of ten million rupees of war indemnity and the hilly countries between the rivers of Beas and the Indus, including Hazara.

On March 16, 1846, seven days after the treaty of March, 1846, which had sealed the fate of the Sikh Kingdom, the British signed a treaty with Raja Gulab Singh by virtue of which, all the mountainous country lying to the east of the Indus and the west of Ravi, was given to the Government in consideration of rupees 75 lacs, including Kashmir. This treaty was made in order to satisfy the indemnity of rupees ten million imposed on the Sikh State after its defeat at Sabraon. A reduction of rupees twenty-five lacs was made in consideration of the valleys of Kulu, Mandi and Kangra, which the British retained with them.

Treaty (sale deed) of Amritsar. The State of Jammu and Kashmir was sold to Gulab Singh in 1846 in return for his treachery to the Sikhs for a paltry sum of seventy-five lac rupees. The Treaty did not mention anything relating to the internal administration of the State. Obviously, Gulab Singh was given a free hand to deal with matters as he chose.

Articles 1, 3, 9 and 10 of the Treaty of Amritsar are given below :

Article 1. The British Government transfers and makes over for ever in independent possession to Maharaja Gulab Singh and the heirs male of his body, all the hilly or mountainous country with its dependencies situated to the eastward of the River Indus and the westward of the River Ravi, including Chamba and excluding Lahore, being part of the territories ceded to the British Government by the Lahore State, according to the provisions of Article 4 of the Treaty of Lahore, dated 9th March, 1846.

Article 2. The eastern boundary of the tract transferred by the foregoing article to Maharaja Gulab Singh shall be laid down by Commissioners appointed by the British Government and Maharaja Gulab Singh respectively, for that purpose, and shall be defined in a separate engagement, after survey.

Article 3. In consideration of the transfer made to him and his heirs by the provisions of the foregoing articles, Maharaja Gulab Singh will pay to the British Government the sum of seventy five lacs (seven and a half millions) of rupees (Nanakshahi), fifty lacs to be paid on or before the 1st October of the current year, A.D. 1846.

Article 4. The limits of the territories of Maharaja Gulab Singh shall not be, at any time, changed without the concurrance of the British Government.

Article 5. Maharaja Gulab Singh will refer to the arbitration of the British Government any disputes or questions that may arise between himself and the Government of Lahore, or any other neighbouring State, and will abide by the decision of British Government.

Article 6. Maharaja Gulab Singh engages for himself and his heirs, to join, with the whole of his military force, the British troops, when employed within the hills, or in the territories adjoining his possessions.

Article 7. Maharaja Gulab Singh engages never to

take, or retain in his service any British subject, nor the subject of any European or American State, without the consent of the British Government.

Article 8. Maharaja Gulab Singh engages to respect, in regard to the territory transferred to him, the provisions of Articles 5, 6 and 7, of the separate engagement between the British Government and the Lahore Darbar, date 11th March, 1846.

Article 9. The British Government will give its aid to Maharaja Gulab Singh in protecting his territories from external enemies.

Article 10. Maharaja Gulab Singh will acknowledge the supremacy of the British Government and will in token of such supremacy present annually to the British Government one horse, twelve shawl goats of approved breed (six male and six female) and three pairs of Kashmiri shawls.

Note. In 1893 it was agreed to drop the gift of "twelve perfect shawl goats".

This treaty consisting of ten articles, has been this day settled by Frederick Currie, Esq., and Brevet-Major Henry Montgomery Lawrence, acting under the directions of the Right Honourable Sir Henry Hardinge, G.C.B., Governor-General, on the part of the British Government, and by Maharaja Gulab Singh in person; and the said treaty has been this day ratified by the seal of the Right Honourable Sir Henry Hardinge, G.C.B., Governor-General.

Done at Amritsar, this 16th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1846, corresponding with the 17th day of Rabi-ul-Awwal, 1252 Hijri."

H. Hardinge (L.S.)

Gulab Singh (L.S). F. Currie,

H.M. Lawrence.

Comments. This sale deed, as it would appear is a unique treaty in the history of mankind. Munshi Mohd Din Fauq, a Kashmiri poet and historian, called this deed "the document of the Kashmiri's bondage". On August 5, 1947, Late Mr. Gandhi, remarked that "the treaty of Amritsar was in reality a deed of sale. The seller was the British Governor-General and Maharaja Gulab Singh the buyer. Commonsense dictates that the will of the Kashmiris should decide the fate of Kashmir and Jammu. The sooner it was done the better it was".

This technique of breaking nations and states by driving a wedge in them through well-selected traitors is not something uncommon with the British. They have, rather, proved themselves as experts in the matter. On attaining success in their designs they raise up their tools for generations to come. By way of examples it may be mentioned that during the course of 1857 Indian "mutiny" (which was in fact a last *Jihad* of Muslim India against the British), the Muslims who betrayed the cause of Islam were brought to the surface and kept up for long. In breaking the Usman (Ottoman) Empire, the Sherif of Mecca and his two sons were raised to the status of kings, the Aden and its hitherland has been a field of such—like operations, the Palestine trouble continues to perpetuate, the Sudan was out off from Egypt, Indian sub-continent, for more than a century, remained split up into hundreds of states.

Hindu Dogra Rulers. The State of Jammu and Kashmir was created by the British with Gulab Singh as its first ruler. He ruled from 1846 to 1857. The ruler had already after several extensions of territory east and west of Jammu, conquered Ladakh, a Buddhist country, and had then annexed Skardu, which was under Muslim rule. Gulab Singh died in 1857 and was succeeded by his son Rambir Singh who reigned from 1857 to 1885, who because of his treacherous role, during the War of Independence of 1857, was granted the right of adoption in lieu of natural heirs. It was under the next ruler, Maharaja Partap Singh that a British resident was appointed for the first time. His rule was remarkable for the reassertion of the Kashmir

sovereignty over Gilgit. In 1925, Maharaja Hari Singh succeeded to the title of Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir. He was exited in 1949 and his son Karan Singh was placed as regent. In 1952, the heriditary monarchy was abolished and the regent was elected as the head of the state.

Muslim independence movements. It would not be out of the way to quote some instances, bringing to look some hardships and miseries met out by the people of Kashmir during the Sikh and Dogra rule in the Valley. This account helps in assessing the mis-management, maltreatment and other inhuman miseries let loose on these poor human beings all these long weary years under the Sikh and Dogra Regimes.

The Sikh rulers did not prove to be good administrators. They let loose atrocities on the poor Muslim Kashmiris.

Mr. Moorcraft who visited Kashmir in 1824, made a report on contemporary Kashmir in detail. He described that during the Sikh rule in Kashmir, the Muslims of the Valley were being treated very badly. Furnishing this account further he observed: "The Sikhs looked up the Kashmiris as little better than cattle. The murder of a native by a Sikh was punished with a fine by the government from Rs. 16 to 20, of which Rs. 4 were paid to the family of the deceased, in case he was a Hindu, and Rs. 2 if he was a Muslim.

The Muslims of Kashmir suffered much at the bands of Dogras. For instance Knight wrote:

"An enormous transport service is needed to supply the garrisons on the North Frontier with grain; and the Kashmir authorities have been utterly careless of comfort, and even of the lives of the unfortunate wretches, who trudge for months over the wearisome marches on that arid country. They fall on the road to perish of hunger and thirst, and thinly clad as they are, are destroyed hundreds at a time by the cold on the snowy pass. When a man is seized for this form of *begar* (forceful labour) his wife and children hang by him, weeping, taking it almost for granted that

they will never see him again. A gang of these poor creatures, heavily laden with grain, toiling along the desolate range between Astori and Gilgit, on a burning summer day, urged on by a sepoy guard, is perhaps pitiable a spectacle as anything to be seen on the roads of Siberia. But these are not convicts and criminals, they are Musalman farmers, harmless subjects of the Maharaja".

Sir Abion Benerji, one of the Cabinet Ministers of the Maharaja in 1929 wrote :

"Jammu and Kashmir State is labouring under many disadvantages, with a large Muhammadan population absolutely illiterate, labouring under poverty and very low economic conditions of living in the villages, and practically governed like a dum-driven cattle. There is no touch between the government and the people, no suitable opportunity for representing grievances, and the administrative machinery itself requires overhauling from tóp to bottom".

Muslim awakening. The people of the districts of Mirpur and Poonch serving in the British army were taken abroad to serve the cause of theAllies during the World War I—1914-1918. Returning home, these soldiers and officers had a great sense of realisation of the maltreatment their people were meeting at the hands of the tyrannt Hindu Dogra rulers. Moreover, Kashmiri students who graduated from the Muslim University of Aligarh, had got similar realisation. They had found that the Hindu Maharaja had no hesitation in killing Muslims in Kashmir. The people in the Valley were governed like a dumb-driven cattle. Their was altogether no opportunity even for representing grievances. It was found that all the administrative machinery from top to toe required overhauling. Despite the Muslims being in overwhelming majority, were labouring under poverty and were kept in absolute illiteracy. There was strict ban on political activities and even on reading newspapers.

In such an awe-inspiring atmosphere the young Muslim graduates of the Muslim University Aligarh, including

Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah and Ch. Ghulam Abbas, stepped forward for the awakening of their people and thus leading them to independence.

In taking a practical step towards freedom, in the very first instance, they established a reading room which was named "Fateh Kadal". The Muslim students of Jammu also joined hands with them by starting similar activities in 1930. Thereafter, the students of Jammu and Srinagar also stepped forward to support their co-students to continue their struggle for better treatment of the Muslims in the State.

The Hindu Maharaja would not tolerate this. In spite of redressing the grievances of the young students of his own state, he was enraged. The Maharaja announced sever action against the students. Then arrests of the students were made on a large scale. The students made agitations against such arrests. Resorting to severe action the Dogra police opened fire on the agitating students on July 18, 1931 which resulted in the instantaneous death of about 24 Muslim students.

A general agitation against the Hindu Dogra Regime took place in the valley. One person Abdesul Kadir had also taken part in it. He was arrested by the State authorities. The Muslim population began to agitate against this arrest. The police opened fire on the innocent Muslims resulting in the killing of about 24 Muslims on July 13, 1931 at Srinagar.

All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference. Only 25 Muslim Kashmiris including Abdul Kadir were shot-dead in Srinagar, but they awakened the whole downtrodden Kashmiri nation. The Muslims of Kashmir joined together and formed All-Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference in the summar of 1932. Thousands of Muslims took part in its first session which was inaugurated in October, 1932. At the instance of Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah and Ch. Ghulam Abbas the Kashmiris agreed to change the political pattern of the Muslim Conference, on the model of the

Indian Congress, by changing it to that of the National Conference in June, 1938. Soonafter, it was felt that the new National Conference was not taking up so much interest as that Muslim Conference. Hence the Muslim Conference was revived. Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah, however, remained with the National Conference till his arrest in 1953.

In June, 1946, the Muslim Conference appealed the Muslims to be alert and active for gaining their objectives. It passed a resolution to the effect that the Muslims of the Kashmir should prepare themselves for action if they wished to gain their objectives of accession of Kashmir to Pakistan. The State Government banned the annual session of the Muslim Conference of October, 1946. Prominant leaders of Kashmir were jailed. The Muslim Conference, in spite of the absence of its prominent leaders, took up the compaign of fighting the elections in the "so called" State Assembly and won 15 out of 21 elective Muslim seats. The National Conference boycotted the elections altogether. All-Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference passed the following resolution on July 19,1947:

"This convention of the Muslim Conference has arrived at the conclusion that keeping in view the geographical conditions, 80 per cent Muslim majority out of total population, the passage of important rivers of the Punjab through the State, the language, cultural, social and economic connections of the people and the proximity of the borders of the State with Pakistan, are all facts which make it necessary that the Jammu and Kashmir State should accede to Pakistan."

On August 14, 1947, the Muslims of Kashmir State made unequivocally, in favour of accession to Pakistan as the Muslim Conference had already passed the resolution to that effect on July 19, 1947.

Outcome of Pakistan became a certainty. The Maharaja become apprehensive. He feared that the ex-soldiers of the districts of Poonch and Mirpur might revolt against him. There were not less than 80 thousand ex-soldiers in the

districts of Poonch alone. Hence, the Maharaja taking precautionary steps, secretly despatched his troops to the districts of Poonch, Mirpur and Muzaffarabad. Apart from Hindu Dogra army, the Maharaja imported numerous armed Sikhs and Hindus from the Punjab belonging to a militant Hindu organisation, well-known as the Rashtria Sevak Sangh. Their well-organised plot was to put to death the entire Muslim population as soon as Pakistan came into being. Under a pre-thought plan visits of prominent Hindu leaders were also arranged. Mr. Gandhi and the Congress President were also among the visitors.

Feeling the bitter consequences, the Maharaja avoided a hasty step. Most cunningly he thought of concluding a Standstill Agreement with these two countries. Pakistan accepted the offer while India was in an obstinate attitude. The Standstill Agreement with Pakistan came into effect on August 15, 1947.

The Maharaja then hatched a conspiracy with India and invited the Indian Army to occupy the State. Moreover, the Dogra police, Rashtria Sevak Sangh (RSS) and the Indian Army, started genocide of Muslims from Kashmir. The Hindu compaign resulted in killing about 2 lakh of Muslims of Jammu and Kashmir, while more than one million had to take shelter in Pakistan.

Kashmir after 1947.

The establishment of the rule of a Hindu Moharaja over a predominantly Muslim State was an accident in history.

Ever since the State of Jammu and Kashmir has been in entirely in the hands of non-Muslims, the administration has been notoriously oppressive. On several occasions, the Muslim population has raised its voice against its oppressors, though only to be suppressed with the severe hand. The sustained policy of the Hindu tyrants has been to keep the Muslim population in a perpetual State of abject poverty and misery.

To add to the misfortunes of the Kashmiris, at the time of partition, Radcliffe handed over Muslim majority

districts of Gurdaspur to India, thus giving that country a narrow hand-link with the Jammu and Kashmir State and making the unhappy sequence of events inevitable. If Radcliffe has given a judicial and not a political award, no dispute could possibly has arisen between Pakistan and Bharat.

When Sir Cyril Radcliffe was appointed to demarcate the disputed frontiers between India and Pakistan, there was secret understanding between the British and Hindu Congress leaders, that the line would be drawn up in such a way as to give India an access to Kashmir. It is widely believed that Sir Cyril Radcliffe's Award in its original draft had given Gurdaspur to Pakistan, but he was persuaded by the Lord Mountbatten, the Governor-General to alter his Award in so far as Gurdaspur was concerned. This mischievous Award given by the Radcliffe, the great betrayer of Muslim cause, contained the fateful misery of the innocent Kashmiris.

Radcliffe's Boundary Award. Sir Cyril Radcliffe, *K.C.*, had been appointed as the sole arbitrator to draw the boundary line for dividing the Punjab and Bengal between the Muslims and the Hindus. He arrived in the sub-continent on July 8, 1947. Radcliffe acknowledged the sacred nature of the trust reposed in him and the sanctity of his obligation. He gave a solemn assurance to discharge his duty faithfully and honestly.

The words "fairness" and "impartiality" were on his lips while "prejudice" and "partiality" were deep at Radcliffe's heart.

He betrayed shamelessly his high office, he betrayed the Muslim India and he betrayed his declared assurance for being impartial in the award.

In Gurdaspur district the distribution of population (according to 1941 Census Report) was as follows :

Hindus.	19.2 per cent	=40.3 per cent.
Sikhs.	21.1 ,, ,,	

Muslims	51.2 per cent.	59.6 per cent.
Indian Christians.	4.4 ,, ,,	
Scheduled castes (Non-Hindus)	4 ,, ,,	

In the tehsils of Gurdaspur and Batala, the Muslim population was 70 per cent. The boundaries of these tehsils were contiguous to that of Pakistan. The Christians and the Schedule caste people had declared their will to join Pakistan. But denying thc inherent right of majority and in utter disregard of the expressed will of the majority people in the district Redcliffe at the instance of Lord Mountbatten, in his boundary line award demarcated the Gurdaspur to Hindu India.

The Dawn characterising the Radcliffe's boundary award as "Rape of the Punjab" observed :

"An analysis of some relevant facts and figures concerning the Punjab shows that this "neutral" Chairman of the Boundary Commission has been unfair to East Bengal, He has been even more so to West Punjab. The notional division had done to Punjab, the same grave injustice as it had done to Bengal and it was taken for granted that the final delimitation of boundary would make a fairer adjustment. Sir Cyril Radcliffe has done exactly the opposite. His one aim seems to have been to discover how much he could give away from the west to the east, in other words, to what further extent he would still further truncate Pakistan. Out of four tehsils of the Gurdaspur district he has awarded three to East Punjab and he has divided two out of Lahore's three tehsils between the two parts of the Punjab. One has only to look at the population statistics of these fine tehsils, community-wise, to understand the gross injustice and the perversity of his decisions.

"In the Gurdaspur tehsil Muslims numbered 171,488, while Hindus and Sikhs together number 133,674. In the Batala tehsil Muslims are 207,277 while Hindus and Sikhs are 149,846. In the Pathankot tehsil the Muslim majority over the combined Hindu-Sikh total is : 149,600 to 86,800. Coming to the other divided district Lahore, we find that in the Kasur tehsil Muslims were 237,038 as against 158, 037 Hindus and Sikhs, while in Chunian tehsil the

Muslim majority is: 237,820 to 140,110. And yet Sir Cyril Radcliffe has no hesitation in transferring these large tracts of territory in the two districts representing some 2,300 square miles of more fertile land, from West Punjab to East Punjab.

"However carefully one reads his report and discovers not a shred of agreement which may explain this strange decision, this flagrant departure from the basic principle of contiguous majority, this violence to explicit terms of reference. All that Sir Cyril Radcliffe cares to say is that 'after weighing to the best of my ability such other factors as appeared to me relevant as affecting the fundamental basis of contiguous majority areas, I have come to the decision set out in the schedule, what other factors' he has weighed? For what reason or reasons did these unmentioned factors appear to him to be so 'relevant' as to justify violence to the fundamental basis of contiguous majority? Sir Cyril Radcliffe is no longer in this country to be encountered and questioned on these points. After having written his report and drawn lines higgledy-piggledy across the map of the Punjab, Bengal and Sylhet, this 'eminent' K.C. has departed the scene of his judicial aberrations. But this sketchy, unconvincing and uncommunicative report remains to mock those who had trusted all their eggs into the single Radcliffe basket."

The result of this unreasonable division was disastrous. By allowing access of India to the State of Jammu and Kashmir by denying the award of these Muslim majority tehsils of Gurdaspur district to Pakistan, gates for floods of troubles on the innocent Kashmiri Muslims from secular India under opened. The rivers passing through the West-Wing most Pakistan have their origions in Kashmir. An access of Hindu India to Kashmir on the one hand, brought miseries to the Kashmiris, on the other hand, it disrupted the irrigation arrangements for West-Wing of Pakistan. Mr. David Lilienthal remarked "No army, with bombs and shell-fire, could devastate a land so thoroughly as Pakistan could be devastated by the simple empedient of Indian's permanently shutting off sources of water that keep the fields and the people of Pakistan alive."

CHAPTER 4

FIRST JIHAD CAMPAIGN FOR LIBERATION OF KASHMIR

The Kashmir Dispute "artificially fostered by the Partition of India" has been before the Security Council since 1947. But the case still lies undecided before the UNO, although Bharat has, by stages, integrated India-held Kashmir with her. The so-called UN representatives, Commissions and Mediators have come and gone back to Lake Success to report, in their leisurely drawn-up learned reports, their failure to bring about a settlement.

During all this time, the Government of Pakistan have made their endeavours to solve the problem by peaceful means and have, from time to time, made diverse constructive proposals with a genuine desire to seek an honourable solution. In a spirit of sincere helpfulness, the Government of Pakistan offered their unstinted co-operation to the Security Council and its Mediation Commissions, to reach a just solution of this very vexed problem.

But the attitude of the Government of India has been all along far from helpful. Right from the beginning of this dispute, India has followed a deliberate policy of obstruction in all efforts to come to a peaceful settlement. India has been assiduously following a technique under which she avoided making firm commitments and where such commitments became unavoidable, she wriggled herself out of them by harping upon her own made-up interpretation of the terms.

Pakistan is not afraid of the verdict of the people of Kashmir. But India is. She knows for certain that the people of Kashmir, in a free vote, will surely join Pakistan, and not India. She is determined, therefore, to keep her forces in the State and to prevent a free vote.

The facts of the case are now well-known to the whole world. It has become abundantly clear that India is not willing to abide by her earlier commitments of allowing the people of Kashmir to decide the future of their country through a free and impartial plebiscite.

Kashmir has been a region of enduring peace and tranquillity through the ages. But it is an irony of fate that Kashmir which produced such distinguished persons as Dr. Muhammad Iqbal, Poet of the east, Gama, the World Champion in Wrestling, should continue to suffer untold humiliation, inhuman hardships, tyranny and repression under the Hindu-Dogra regime. The establishment of the rule of a Hindu Maharaja over a predominantly Muslim State was an accident in history. The State of Jammu and Kashmir was sold to Gulab Singh in return for his treachery to the Sikhs, by the British East India Company in 1840 for a paltry sum of 75 lakhs of rupees. Ever since, the State has been entirely in the hands of non-Muslims and the administration has been notoriously oppressive. On several occasions, the Muslim population has raised its voice against its oppressors, though only to be suppressed with the utmost severity. The sustained policy of the Hindu tyrants, has been to keep the Muslim population in a perpetual state of abject poverty and misery.

To add to the misfortunes of the Kashmiris, at the time of Partition, Radcliffe handed over Muslim majority district of Gurdaspur to India, thus giving that country a narrow land-link with the Jammu and Kashmir State and making the unhappy sequence of events inevitable. If Radcliffe had given a judicial and not a political award, no dispute could possibly have arisen between Pakistan and Bharat.

When Sir Cyril Radcliffe was appointed to demarcate the disputed frontiers between India and Pakistan, there was secret understanding between the British and Hindu Congress leaders, that the line would be drawn up in such a way as to give India an access to Kashmir. It is widely believed that Sir Cyril Radcliffe's Award in its original draft had given Gurdaspur to Pakistan but he was persuaded by the then Governor-General, Lord Mountbatten, to alter his Award

in so far as Gurdaspur was concerned. This mischievous Award given by Radcliffe, the great betrayer of Muslim cause, contained the fateful misery of innocent Kashmiris.

The history of Kashmir dates far back into the legendary past and down to the time of incorporation of Kashmir in 1588 in the Moghal Empire. In 1846, Kashmir fell into the hands of the British, who made it over to Gulab Singh, a Dogra chief, for a cash payment and in consideration of his services rendered to the British. By virtue of a treaty he was recognised as an independent sovereign of Kashmir. Gulab Singh was succeeded by Maharaja Partap Singh, and later on by Sir Hari Singh, who was the ruler at the time of Partition of the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent.

Kashmir's Real Ties with Pakistan. Kashmir forms a natural part of Pakistan. The letter "K" in the word "Pakistan" stands for Kashmir. Geographically, the State is a part of Pakistan with which it has a common boundary of several hundred miles. Its only connection with India is a narrow strip which was most unfairly and unjustly handed over to India under the Radcliffe Award, to make road to Kashmir.

The State has a population of over four million, an overwhelming majority of which is Muslim. According to the official census reports the Muslims from 93 per cent of the population in the Kashmir Province and nearly 60 per cent in the much smaller Province of Jammu. The Muslim population, in the entire State is approximately 80 per cent.

The rivers of Kashmir—the Indus, the Jhelum and the Chenab, through which flows the life-blood of the State—all flow towards Pakistan. The rivers are extremely important arteries of commerce and trade owing to the ruggedness of surface in Kashmir, where other means of communication are few. To a State like Pakistan the sources and the upper reaches of the rivers are matters of very great concern and, as such, Kashmir deserves our fullest attention. It is here that suitable sites for constructing canal headworks are located. It is here that the rivers can be tamed to control floods by constructing dams across them. And it is only here, that

potential hydroelectric sources lie. If such areas belong to any power inimical to our interests, even a change in the course of rivers is not beyond the scope of modern technical achievements.

The means of communication of Kashmir also open towards Pakistan. The Sialkot-Jammu Road, the Gujrat-Bhimber Road, the Jhelum-Mirpur Road, the Jhelum Valley route, and the Abbottabad-Mansehra-Muzaffarabad Road are all links between Pakistan and Kashmir. The route from Abbottabad northward through Kunhar Valley to Gilgit is capable of serving as a strong link between Peshawar Division of N.W.F.P. and Kashmir. The route is, up till now, not fully explored and properly utilised. In future too, it may not be quite important from purely military point of view but at the same time it is destined to play a significant role in fostering better political relations between Pakistan and the USSR by making the territorial contact between the two countries more effective.

Thus, geographically, economically, culturally and religiously, Kashmir is a part of Pakistan. The overwhelming Muslim character of its population, its strategic position inrelation to Pakistan, the flow of its waters, the direction of its roads, the channels of its trade, the continual and intimate association which binds its people to Pakistan since times immemorial, link Kashmir indissolubly with Pakistan.

The trouble. On the 15th of August, 1947, when the Partition of this sub-continent took place, the Jammu and Kashmir State, like other States, became free to accede either to Pakistan or to India.

The geographical, economic and cultural ties of the State with Pakistan demanded that it should accede to Pakistan. Quite naturally, therefore, the overwhelming majority of the people of the State pressed for the State's accession to Pakistan and demonstrated their feelings in no uncertain manner.

The interest of the Hindu ruler, however, pointed in the direction of India, though at first he dared not take an overt step in open defiance of the wishes of the vast majority

of his subjects. To avoid an immediate conflict and in order to gain time, the Maharaja adopted the trick of entering into a Standstill Agreement with Pakistan in August, 1947, with no intention of abiding by a minute longer than suited his purpose.

In September, 1947, repression and massacre of Muslims of the Jammu and Kashmir State increased and they began to seek refuge in Pakistan in ever-increasing numbers. The repression on the Muslims went on increasing relentlessly and the Hindu army of the State perpetrated acts of the utmost savagery. In sheer desperation the Muslim population of the State broke out in open revolt in several areas and declared their independence of the tyrant Hindu ruler.

These events aroused strong feelings of sympathy for the repressed and persecuted Muslims of the State throughout Pakistan, particularly in the border areas where thousands of wounded and maimed refugees sought shelter. It was, therefore, only natural that their kinsmen as well as tribal sympathisers from neighbourly northern areas should go across the border in an endeavour to save over three million of their Muslim brethren. At this stage (October 26, 1947) the Maharaja who had already hatched a conspiracy with India, applied to India for accession and invited military aid to crush his Muslim subjects.

The Government of India hastened to accept the so-called accession and, under cover of 'protecting the State against external aggression', immediately despatched armed forces to occupy the greater part of the State. A big army was stationed for suppressing the democratic aspirations of the people of the State and establishing a military regime there.

The First Jihad Conflict. The fraudulently sought accession of the State to Bharat and its forced occupation by the Indian troops were acts of the gravest provocation to Pakistan. But Pakistan decided to meet provocation with conciliation. From October, 1947, onwards the Government of Pakistan made repeated efforts to reach a settlement with the Indian Government whereby the people of Kashmir could settle their future in a free plebiscite.

Immediately after the entry of the Indian troops into the State on October 27, 1947, the Pakistan Government proposed a conference between the Governors-General and the Prime Ministers of Pakistan and India. The proposal contained that the two Governors-General should be given full powers to restore law and order, to undertake the administration of the State and organize a plebiscite without delay under their joint control and supervision.

India rejected the proposal and practically wanted to force a military decision in the Jammu and Kashmir State and maintaining, at the same time, a farcical pretence of ultimately obtaining the verdict of the people of the State through plebiscite held after military subjugation of the State was complete. This was just as India did in Hyderabad and Junagadh. But India could not achieve a military decision against the Kashmiri and other Mujahids.

On January 1, 1948, India took her case to the UNO, in the shape of a complaint against the alleged invasion of the territories of Jammu and Kashmir by Pakistan nationals and tribesmen from Peshawar and Dera Ismail Khan Divisions of West Pakistan. India claimed validity of accession of Kashmir to her, while Pakistan denied both such a validity and the alleged aid given to Mujahids in Kashmir.

An all-out offensive was launched by the Indian forces in April, 1948, with unmistakable object of subjugating the entire State and of presenting the world with a *fait accompli.* The repercussions of the Indian drive in Kashmir were immediately felt in Pakistan. The Indian troops constituted a clear threat to Pakistan on the rear as well as on the flank, and the entire border between Pakistan and Jammu and Kashmir was thrown into a state of dangerous insecurity. In the face of this situation and in order to safeguard Pakistan's vital interests a limited number of Pakistan troops were sent to Kashmir early in May, 1948, to hold certain defensive positions.

India Refuses Plebiscite in Kashmir. Under UNCIP negotiations, a cease-fire was arranged in Kashmir on 1st January, 1949. The next step under the two UNCIP

Resolutions was the execution of a Truce Agreement for the withdrawal of Pakistani forces and the bulk of Indian forces. This was to be a condition precedent to the next step in the free and impartial plebiscite to be held under the UN auspices to decide the question of Kashmir's accession to Pakistan or to India. India's technique directed towards dodging the Kashmir Issue consisted in accepting proposals for mediation but rejecting all steps relating to arbitration.

First Refusal. India rejected the proposals of 1948. UN Commission called a joint committee of Pakistan and Indian representatives. India and Pakistan both agreed to submit to the committee their plans for withdrawal of forces. Pakistan did so on March 9, 1949. India, at first, asked for more time, later on refused to honour its agreement.

Second Refusal. India refused to accept the UN proposal of August 1949. UN continuously tried to persuade India to honour her agreement. But she always refused to do so. At last, UN Commission concluded that India was not prepared to withdraw the bulk of her forces and was seeking to cover the refusal by interpreting the UNCIP Resolutions, in a way to suit her ulterior motives. On the recommendation of the UN Commission, UNO appointed Admiral Nimitz, as the Plebiscite Administrator to arbitrate the differences arising from interpretation of these two resolutions. Pakistan accepted the proposal but Bharat rejected it.

Third Refusal. India rejected the December, 1949 proposals. Admiral Nimitz reported his failure to the Security Council and asked its President, General McNaughten, to mediate. General McNaughten, after consultation with both the parties, formulated proposals for demilitarisation. Pakistan accepted the McNaughten proposals but Bharat rejected them.

Fourth Refusal. In July 1950, under the UN Resolution of March 1950, the Security Council appointed Sir Owen Dixon as UN representative. He was entrusted with the task of effecting demilitarization within five months.

Sir Owen Dixon discussed his proposals for demilitarization but both parties rejected these proposals.

Fifth Refusal. In January 1951, the Commonwealth Prime Ministers, who had met in London, considered removal or disbandment of all troops of interested parties as essential for holding a free plebiscite in Kashmir. They suggested for the security of the State :

(*i*) a Commonwealth force from Australia and New Zealand at their own expense ;

(*ii*) a joint force of India and Pakistan ;

(*iii*) a local force to be raised by the Plebiscite Administrator.

The proposals were accepted by Pakistan one by one, but India rejected them as usual.

Sixth Refusal. In March 1951, Ambassador Muniz, of Brazil, proposed to both India and Pakistan that they should agree to arbitration on all points of difference arising from the two UNCIP Resolutions, of 13th August, 1948 and 5th January, 1949. Pakistan accepted these proposals but Bharat did not agree to them.

Seventh Refusal. The Anglo-American Resolution presented to the Security Council on February 22, 1951, proposed a new solution to the Kashmir Problem. UN representative was to prepare plans for a free and impartial plebiscite. If lack of agreements between the parties prevented the UN representative from preparing an agreed programme for both demilitarization and plebiscite, they were to be asked to submit points of difference to arbitration under the auspices of the International Court. While Pakistan showed its willingness to accept these proposals, India rejected them.

Eighth Refusal. Under the Anglo-US Resolution of March 30, 1951, Dr. Frank P. Graham was appointed as United Nations representative in Kashmir. He came to Indo-Pakistan sub-continent as mediator. But on account of India's intransigence his mission ended in failure. He submitted his report to the Security Council on October 16,

1951, and recommended that both India and Pakistan should try to improve relations between them and that Security Council should try again to effect demilitarization of the State of Jammu and Kashmir through the medium of negotiations.

Ninth Refusal. Under another Anglo-US Resolution adopted in October 1951, Dr. Graham was instructed to continue his efforts to obtain agreement of the parties on a plan for effecting the demilitarization. But he failed to evolve an acceptable plan for the demilitarization of Kashmir and free plebiscite to decide the State's future as India did not agree to the quantum of troops embodied in the demilitarization scheme which sought to fix the ratio between India and Pakistan troops on the two sides of the cease-fire line.

Tenth Refusal. On May 20, 1952, Dr. Graham resumed talks with the Government of Pakistan and India. But on September 24, 1952, as usual, he reported to the Security Council his failure to effect an agreement between India and Pakistan to reach on demilitarization of Kashmir.

Eleventh Refusal. Another Anglo-American Resolution was introduced on November 5, 1952. It urged immediate negotiations at the UN Headquarters between India and Pakistan to reach an agreement on the specific number of forces to remain on each side of the cease-fire line at the end of the demilitarization in Kashmir. But on December 8, 1952, India rejected flatly the Anglo-American proposal to demilitarize the territory of Kashmir prior to a plebiscite. In December 1952, Pakistan had agreed in the UNO to India's long-cherished demand of keeping 28,000 troops on the Indian side of the sease-fire line at the time of demilitarization in Kashmir, provided the Azad Kashmir forces were left intact. But on December 20, 1952, Pandit Nehru rejected Pakistan's demilitarization proposal for Kashmir.

Twelfth Refusal: Geneva Talks Failed. The talks on proposals embodied in another Anglo-American resolution approved on December 23, 1952, on demilitarization of Kashmir, which began between the Indian and Pakistani delegations

on February 4, 1953, achieved no progress towards the solution of the Kashmir Question. The talks centred round the demilitarization of Kashmir and the number of troops on each side of the cease-fire line during the holding of a plebiscite to determine Kashmir's future status. The proposals were rejected by India.

In reporting Geneva Talks' failure on March 31, 1953, Dr. Graham said that while during the negotiations "there has been some narrowing of the gap between the positions of the Governments on the question of the number and character of the forces to remain on each side of the cease-fire line at the end of the period of demilitarization, a substantial difference in position still remains." It is observed that "the document, like some of its predecessors, is a master-piece of equivocation and evasion and fully reflects the shilly-shallying policy which the American-controlled UN has been following since it became party to the problem." Pakistan accused Dr. Graham of "continuous yielding of ground in face of Indian intransigence which amounts in effect to an endorsement, and abatement of the Indian attitude." The proposals made by Dr. Graham had "avowedly no other object than to meet India's wishes with regard to the number of forces to be retained on its side of the cease-fire line.

Direct Indo-Pak Negotiation. Otherwise known as Ali-Nehru Talks, bore no fruit either. Preliminary talks between Mr. Muhammad Ali, ex-Prime Minister of Pakistan, and Mr. Jawahar Lal Nehru to settle all disputes were held in London in June, 1953. They proposed to meet again in Karachi. In the last week of July, 1955, Mr. Nehru came to Karachi. Talks on the disputes were held in a cordial atmosphere. Mr. Nehru was "very happy" with the results but acknowledged that a solution of the Kashmir problem was no nearer. "We all know that Kashmir is the toughest problem," he said, "and there is no good in my saying that it is nearer a solution."

Delhi Agreement, or Ali-Nehru Agreement. During their four-day (17th to 20th April, 1953) Delhi talks the Prime Ministers of Pakistan and India discussed the Kashmir Dispute at some length. They resolved to settle it in

accordance with the wishes of the people of that State with a view to promoting their well-being. The wishes of the people could be ascertained by conducting a fair and impartial plebiscite. Such a plebiscite had been proposed and agreed upon some years ago. But progress could not be made because of lack of agreement with regard to this. It was decided that a Plebiscite Administrator for Kashmir should be appointed by the end of April 1954. It was also decided that committees of military and other experts should be appointed to advise the Prime Ministers on the implementation of "preliminary issue" relating to the plebiscite. It was agreed that on the Plebiscite Administrator's formal appointment and induction into office he would examine the situation and report on it. He would then make his proposal for preparation of a fair and impartial plebiscite in the entire State.

The direct Indo-Pak negotiations were in every sense "within the framework of the UN." The UNO had desired both the parties to settle the dispute through bilateral talks. The question still remains a dispute between India and Pakistan, and as such before the United Nations. The Communists, taking advantage of Pakistan's disappointment at UNO, began to say that the case be withdrawn from UNO.

But India wishes that the Kashmir case be withdrawn from UNO, presumably because she had utterly failed before the bar of world opinion. This was to save herself from further insult. She wanted Kashmir—an international affair—to be turned into a local and internal affair and to do so she liked just as she did in the case of Hyderabad State. Pakistan was not at all prepared to withdraw the case from UNO. Any settlement, if reached, would be reported to UNO and the Security Council would decide as she might desire.

Pakistan's Pledge. Pakistan has made it abundantly clear that it stands pledged to continue unrelentingly the struggle to obtain for the Kashmir people the free exercise of their right to self-determination. Pakistan considers it its duty to try and reach out to the people of Kashmir,

to secure their right of self-determination at all costs. "Their sorrow is our sorrow, their suffering is our suffering, their misery is our misery, and their hardship is our hardship," declared the Prime Minister of Pakistan. Pakistan is also getting alive to the full-throated shouts of "Pakistan Zindabad."

Abdullah coup in Kashmir. On the one hand, through Ali-Nehru negotiations, India was posing to be on friendly terms with Pakistan and, on the other, Abdullah *coup* in Kashmir was being engineered feverishly. It was perhaps a ruse to give an impression of friendliness before striking hard.

At the dead of night on August 8, 1953, Sheikh Abdullah was dismissed from the premiership of India-held Kashmir and arrested along with 30 prominent officials. It may be recalled that Abdullah was taken out of prison in 1946, just after Partition and installed as Prime Minister of Kashmir to serve as a traitor to the Muslim cause in Kashmir. He was given to understand by Hindu leaders that there would be no communalism in Kashmir. So long as he danced to the tunes of Bharat he was hailed as "Sheri-Kashmir." But when, on realising Hindu mentality regarding Kashmir, he refused to dance to Bharati tunes and tried to go against the dictates of Hindu India, he was sent back to jail and Bakhshi Ghulam Muhammad, Sheikh Abdullah's deputy and a confirmed subservient stooge, was now stepped into his shoes. Bharat utilised Sheikh Abdullah's services in various ways. He was used as a "show-boy" at international level, when in Kashmir Dispute India wanted to show the world that Muslims of the State were with her. His presence as a Muslim Prime Minister of Kashmir was exploited to confuse Muslim world opinion regarding occupied part of the State. The 'accession' of Kashmir to India was declared in his time. Freewill of the Kashmiris was suppressed by force.

But, before long, Abdullah saw quite clearly that a resurgence of communalism in India would swallow up Kashmir. Bharat's communalism continued to arouse the gravest apprehensions in the minds of the Kashmir people

which led Sheikh Abdullah to demand "Kashmir's separate entity." He tried to represent in very subdued terms the perils facing his people—their mass annihilation—at the hands of Bharat's communalists. Backed by his "Constituent Assembly" he adopted successive measures wholly unpalatable to India. It was decided to abolish 'zamindari' in Kashmir without compensation. The new flag of Occupied Kashmir was very different from the Indian flag, sought to break the symbolic unity of Kashmir with India. There was a decision to terminate the monarchy in Kashmir. Uneasiness, perplexity, alarm and general feeling of disgust were the reactions in India to these measures. Underlying these measures was felt a scheme for asserting Kashmir's independence from India. Hindus felt alarmed at this as India had spent over Rs. 200 crores on the State and was committed to much more.

On the other hand, Communists in Bharat wanted to take the accession of Kashmir with India as final. Agitations throughout India were staged to this effect. "One flag; one constitution and one supreme head of the State" was demanded. Abdullah's loyalty to Bharat was widely doubted in Bharat Union both officially and unofficially. His persistent refusal to go to Delhi despite Mr. Nehru's commands, and indications of his anti-Bharat trend of mind were interpreted as confirmed signs of revolt and there was a widespread demand for bringing him to book. A open clash with Abdullah would have weakened Bharat's stand on Kashmir. The alternative of engineering an open revolt in the Jummu and Kashmir National Conference against Abdullah and to bring about his downfall was adopted.

On August 3, 1953, Abdullah declared that "the accession of Kashmir to India in 1947, forced by the circumstances, was legally complete. *But it could be considered to have become final only when verified by the free-will of the people.* He pointed out that extreme rightist agitation in Kashmir in favour of full merger with India had caused dissension within the country and that it was almost impossible to convince the Muslim population that a

merger would be in their interest. He referred to the recruitment of Muslims in State forces, and postal services which were ceded subjects and were under the administrative control of the Government of India but had been most discouraging. "This was having its effects on Muslim minds and leading them to feel that while accession to India had opened innumerable opportunities for the non-Muslim population for employment and betterment, opportunities for Muslims had very much narrowed down even in their own State." Exposing the trend of Hindu mentality Sheikh Abdullah said on July 3, 1953 that he *felt astonished to find that in certain sections in India he was lionised when he would criticise Pakistan, but these very parties would describe him as a Pakistani and communalist when he would criticise communal activities of Indian parties. "When I am dealing out of justice to claims of minorities, I am being showered with praises, but when I try to do likewise to the claims of Muslims I am vilified."*

Main factors responsible for Abdullah's fall were his repudiation of the National Congress's earlier stand that Kashmir's accession to India was complete and final, his growing disillusionment with regard to Indian policies and the possibility that he might have expressed himself in favour of accepting the will of the Kashmiri people and advocating Kashmir's accession to Pakistan. Spontaneous pro-Pakistan slogans throughout Kashmir were heard. The demand for the democratic and legitimate right of plebiscite was growing. Abdullah saw the writing on the wall. He realised that he could not rule under the Indian bayonets indefinitely. He could no longer battle against the fast mounting tide of hostile public opinion. He attempted to side-channel pro-Pakistan feeling by raising the cry of "independent Kashmir." Under the pressure of public feelings in the matter, Sheikh Abdullah refused to act according to the wishes of Hindu India. The upsurge of pro-Pakistan feelings in Kashmir had frightened Delhi and Occupied Kashmir. India acted with dramatic suddenness, and the blow fell. Sheikh Abdullah was dismissed and imprisoned. This was "best news during the last six years" for the

Hindus. What the communalists were asking for in a crude and blatant manner, the Indian Government carried out in a more clever manner. India charged Abdullah with 'maladministration, nepotism and corruption."

Comments. The dismissal of Sheikh Abdullah was a victory for Indian communalism. It was hailed in India as the "best news in several years." Press comments from all over the world expressed universal condemnation of Bharat Government's action in arresting Sheikh Abdullah and imposing Bakhshi "Government" on the people of Kashmir. The sincerity of Pandit Nehru's much-advertised devotion to the ideal of peace and justice was openly questioned.

"It proves, if a proof was needed, that India is determined to keep Kashmir at all costs, that all talk about plebiscite and mutual negotiations is so much stuff for propaganda in the true style of imperialists." *The Irish Times* dated August 12, 1953, under the heading "Struggle for Kashmir" stated, "Mr. Nehru made all sorts of promises, including that of a free plebiscite to decide the wishes of the inhabitants in regard to their political future, but as usually happens in such matters, nothing was done until a few days ago, when Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah, Kashmir's Premier, was suddenly arrested....It is almost certain that although there are vigorous denials from New Delhi, this new move in Kashmir has been instigated by the Indians at the moment when there are more than 10,000 Indian troops in Kashmir." "Until quite recently, Sheikh Abdullah has been regarded as Mr. Nehru's particular pet, now it seems that he has bitten the hand that fed him, daring to express those principles of political independence which Mr. Nehru for so many years has expressed in the case of India." *The Morgon Tindigen*, a Swedish Government Party paper, said, "Whatever happens in Kashmir just as what has happened or will happen elsewhere in Asia—in Tibet and in Indonesia--has replaced European imperialism." The official Dutch Socialist daily, *Het Nrya Volk* said : "It is not the first time Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru in his policy regarding Kashmir (as for instance Hyderabad) seems lacking in conception which he pursues in regard to inter-

national policies and which he desires others to follow." The Egyptian Gazette, *Cairo*, an English language morning daily of the Societe Orientale de Publicity Group, said: "Nehru proclaimed as a champion of democracy, but it is impossible to avoid the conclusion in the light of recent events that he has special brand reserved for Kashmir and that it is labelled "Incorporated in India." The Ankara daily *Hurses* said: "Sheikh Abdullah was always a good means of propaganda for Nehru. There did not exist any such problems as Kashmir for the Indian Premier. According to him, the people of Kashmir had, of their own free-will, acceded to the Indian Republic and Pakistan's allegations, that the Kashmiris were not satisfied with the present state of affairs, were described as propaganda. New developments in Kashmir now definitely show that this is not true. Even Sheikh Abdullah himself had disapproved of the way in which Hindus treated Muslims." Some people regard this fall of the cabinet due to financial disorders. But this development is wholly political and it is connected with the increasing inclination the people of Kashmir feel towards Pakistan." *The New York Times* said: "Kashmir's accession to India was the work of the deposed Maharaja. Sheikh Abdullah, who took over the reins of Government, now has been deposed with the obvious blessing and consent of India. Kashmiris themselves were not consulted on either acting. It is the time that their views should be heard." *The Economist*, dated August 15, 1953, stated: "It is significant that the change has produced riots in Srinagar for the first time since the Kashmir Dispute began, and it looks as if India might have won a plebiscite under the old regime but would not now." "One is astonished by the stiff, hard attitude taken by India . . . ., the moment there is any talk about an endeavour to reach an amicable agreement, India's stipulations do not permit one to conclude that she is willing to make a friendly compromise. In fact the opposite seems true. India intends to hang on her part of Kashmir . . ." contained an editorial to the *Expressen*—a Sweedish journal.

Integrating Occupied Kashmir with India. While

the United Nations leisurely conduct negotiations and their delaying tactics are practically leading nowhere, the Government of India have been taking advantage of the situation to make major moves towards integration of the occupied parts of Kashmir with the Indian Union. The Government of India and its Kashmiri puppets are trying to create such conditions that the UNO would be discouraged from making any positive attempt to secure implementation of the resolutions for a free plebiscite in the State. India considers Kashmir her integral part, a member of the Indian Union. She claims that the "accession" was complete and final. Mr. Nehru stated about Kashmir : "It is desirable for us from the strategic point of view."

India is determined never to make a compromise on Kashmir. A report prepared on January 13, 1953, by the General Secretary of the All-India Congress submitted to the All-India Congress Committee—the policy-making body of India's ruling party—said that it would be idle to think that India would ever make any sort of compromise on principle for the sake of convenience of Pakistan In the Kashmir Dispute, India continues to blame hypocritically that the United Nations has not moved anywhere nearer a solution on Kashmir, because it shuts its eyes to the vital facts that Pakistan is the "aggressor".

India has adopted two diametrically opposed policies with regard to Junagadh and Kashmir. She occupied Junagadh on the plea that it had a Hindu majority, regardless of the fact that its Muslim ruler had acceded, to Pakistan. She occupied Kashmir because its Hindu ruler had acceded to India, regardless of the fact that it had a vast Muslim majority. This is clearly a case of "heads I win, tails you lose." But the UNO is practically silent over this distorted logic.

India used Dollar Aid to Perpetuate Occupation of Kashmir. India had been posing as would-be leader of Asia. The USA under Truman's administration encouraged Indians to believe that the United States accepted her as the future leader of Asia. India gave an impression that she was leaning towards America as against Communism.

But "there is a growing feeling that India is now using the American aid running into hundreds of millions of dollars a year to support its continuation of the endless and unjustified military occupation of Kashmir," wrote the Chicago *Daily Tribune* of Oct. 29, 1953. It further said that the time had come when the United States must have a showdown with India on Asian issues, Americans believe."

Bharat's Big Bait for British Business. In September, 1953, the Trade Commission for the Jammu and Kashmir Government called tenders from British firms in England for equipment and supplies required in connection with development in Jammu and Kashmir. A sum of Rs. 7 crores was said to have been allocated for financing the Kashmir "development" plan. Bharati Government was reported to have made a bid to win over British commerical interests with large contracts for the so-called development projects near Jammu and Kashmir. Pakistani circles regarded the whole project as "bogus" and that "Bharat seems to be preparing to spend a large sum of money to bribe international *banias* under the garb of developing a territory which does not belong to it."

India wished to withdraw Kashmir Issue from the UNO. The object was to treat it as a 'dead' issue. There were rumours regarding "partition of Kashmir between India and Pakistan." But such rumours were described as "absolutely baseless" and a propaganda stunt by some interested parties.

Indian Constitution Extended over Occupied Kashmir. The "Constituent Assembly's" decision of February 1954, which was a farce and was approved only by a fraction of the total strength of 75 members of the Assembly to "ratify accession to India," was officially accepted by India on May 14, 1954. The President of the Indian Union promulgated an order under which "five parts of the Indian Constitution relating to citizenship and fundamental rights, legislative, executive and judicial organs of the Union and their powers, relations between the Union and Occupied Kashmir, finance, trade, commerce and intercourse within the Union and election to the Union Legislative bodies, etc., were

applied to Occupied Kashmir with appropriate modifications." An official announcement said, "The Constituent Assembly of Occupied Kashmir had "set its final seal of approval on the constitutional relationship between the State and the Indian Union to which it acceded in 1947."

Referring to Presidential order on Kashmir, Mr. Nehru said India would not go back on pledge that she had made in the United Nations in regard to Kashmir and that she stood by those assurances and pledges and would like to see them implemented at the first suitable opportunity.

Comments On March 8, 1957, commenting on the "election fiasco" in India-held Kashmir the *New York Times* said in an editorial: "It was an 'election' in which no votes were cast. The India-backed candidates for Kashmir 'Assembly' were declared unopposed Nine candidates who wished to run found nomination papers thrown out on technicalities and their opponents declared elected. Forty-four leading Kashmiris who favour a plebiscite to determine the State's political future are in jail as political prisoners. Naturally, they did not run. This is not an 'election' in any sense of the word. The term 'election' means a choice. The Kashmiris had none."

World Press Censures Bharat's Policy. The British and American Press severely criticised the application of certain provisions of the Indian Constitution to the India-occupied parts of the Jammu and Kashmir State.

The Sunday Express of May 16, 1954, wrote editorially: "Mr. Nehru is always quick to attack colonialism in others. And even quicker to get a colony for himself." The same paper remarked: " But while the deadlock continues, Mr. Nehru slyly acts. He cashes on the delay. He issues his press statements and grabs Kashmir more securely."

The Times of May 17, 1954 editorially wrote under the heading "Mr. Nehru's Two Voices": "Further confusion has been introduced into the Kashmir Dispute by President Rajendra Prasad's proclamation, that under the provisions of Art. 370, the Constitution of the Indian Union will henceforward apply (with insignificant difference) to the

State of Jammu and Kashmir. "The Government of India will find it hard to reconcile this development with its under-taking to the United Nations that the people of Kashmir shall settle their future by an impartially conducted plebiscite and with the understanding which Mr. Nehru and Mr. Mohammad Ali reached last autumn. Delhi's view seems that India cannot alter a decision taken by the 'Constituent Assembly' of Kashmir as the legitimate representative of the Kashmiri people. Yet everyone knows that the 'Assembly' is merely a caucus (a private meeting of political wire-pullers to agree upon candidates to be proposed for an ensuing election) of the National Conference party whose members were for the most part returned without opposition, while the local militia with Indian troops at their back, kept order. True to type, the Kashmir elector voted for the side of the big stick. The Security Council saw through the face and declared that nothing which the 'Assembly' might do could determine the future disposition of the state. At that time India seemed to accept this view herself but she has since turned the Assembly and the Government which controls it to good account."

The New York Times under the caption, "India and Kashmir," said editorially on May 16, 1954: "India's unilateral action in declaring that Kashmir has been brought under the Indian Constitution must be deplored......Morally and politically, it may be highly unwise, precisely because it makes more difficult ultimate solution of the tragic Kashmir problem and worsens, rather than improves, the sensitive relations between India and Pakistan. . . ."

The Medeniyet, a Turkish paper, criticised Bharat for applying its Constitution to Kashmir. The paper said that this action of Bharat had deadlocked the negotiations between Pakistan and Bharat. Remarking that the purpose of Bharat is plain, *Medeniyet* says that "she (Bharat) knows that a plebiscite in Kashmir will undoubtedly result in favour of Pakistan. She is, therefore, trying to gain time to be able to change the situation. The only way out for India is to try to evade her obligations. As a last resort Mr. Nehru

has put forward the excuse of military aid given to Pakistan by the United States. He (Mr. Nehru) has disclosed that the military aid has made a change in the Kashmir situation ; consequently, Bharat's adherence to the obligations will depend on certain conditions." "This is strange logic," concluded the paper.

The Telegram of Toronto (Canada) in its editorial dated January 3, 1953, said, under the caption "India Blocks Plans to Settle Kashmir Dispute" : "In principle, Mr. Nehru has not abandoned his previously stated point of view as far as plebiscite is concerned. But when it has been a matter of taking practical steps for meeting the demand, the New Delhi Government has scarcely acted in accordance with the principles enunciated by Mr. Nehru."

India's stipulations do not allow one to come to the conclusion that she is willing to make a friendly compromise. One rather gets the idea that in all circumstances India intends to "hang on to her part of Kashmir which, in accordance with the pact agreed to by Nehru in the summer of 1952, has become a member of the Indian Union under special conditions as compared with the other Indian States."

"It seems extraordinary that India should adopt so stubborn an attitude when Kashmir is at stake."

"Pakistan has long since been agreeable to settle the fate of Kashmir by means of a plebiscite. On the other hand, India has repeatedly prevented any form of mediation by raising obstacles in the way of reaching positive results. India's behaviour in this matter has by no means placed her in the category of being a spokesman of mutual understanding and friendly solution of national or international conflicts."

"India has nullified all attempts on mediation. Two mediators, one British and one American, have tried to have armed forces on both sides removed from Kashmir before a plebiscite is taken, but both have failed because of India's attitude."

The Sunday Express, London, of July 24, 1955, published the following comments by George Gordon:

"Nehru, that tireless fighter for human freedom and world tranquillity, has been considerably upset by the suggestion that his arrogance towards Goa contrasts oddly with the peace advice he gives so generously to the rest of the world.

"It provoked him to an exhibition of intolerance such as we have not been familiar with since Hitler was on the stump. Let us set him a few more questions.

"What about the Muslim State of Kashmir which he is striving to tear from Pakistan and bring under India? By what authority does he deny the democratic rights of the people of Kashmir to decide their own destiny by a free election?

"What justification has he for keeping 90,000 Indian soldiers in a country that does not belong to him?

"How much responsibility lies upon him for the fact that for nearly a year Sheikh Abdullah, a former Prime Minister of Kashmir, has been locked in prison uncharged and untried, his only offence being a patriot's desire to see his country independent?

"How does the honey-tongued Nehru square that with his bleatings about the rights of all men to be free?

"And what about the Sikhs who are ardently seeking separation from India?

"What about the airlift he is establishing between India and Afghanistan against the opposition of Pakistan? What's his purpose? To aid his friends in Moscow where, as he said recently, a part of his heart lies?

"Nehru flips around the world cooing peace like a Picasso dove. But he is in fact a menace to peace."

In an editorial captioned "India Also Ignores," the Daily *Dispatch* of Erio (Pennsylvania State) said: India, the self-styled "bridge" between the east and the west and persistent international go-between seeking compromise for

peace elsewhere, herself has joined the Powers that flout and ignore the authority of the UN. To try to present the United Nations action before accession, its chief delegate Krishna Menon put on the first filibuster in the UN, speaking for two days. While this was going on in New York, Prime Minister Nehru was entertaining Marshal Zhukov, the Soviet Defence Minister in New Delhi. Premier Chou En-lai of China had also been a guest of the Premier. They plainly said that if Pakistan opposed Kashmir's annexation by force, India would have military aid of the two Communist giants.

In the course of an editorial captioned "India Seizes Kashmir", the *Lockport Union Sun and journal* of Lockport USA said: Prime Minister Nehru who did not hesitate to criticise the Anglo-French-Israeli invasion of Suez is guilty of the same sort of mistake (with less justification) as he orders the integration of the India-held section of Kashmir.

"Words and deeds do not go together in Delhi," wrote the *Pfaller Zeitung*, West German paper, in an editorial, while commenting on the Kashmir issue.

Deadlock. In the first week of March 1954, the Prime Minister of Bharat informed the Government of Pakistan that there was no likelihood of a progress towards the solution of the Kashmir Dispute. He said that the development regarding US military aid to Pakistan had given a set-back to the negotiations between the two Prime Ministers which started in August, 1953. The Prime Minister of Pakistan considered it "most unfortunate" that the Indian Prime Minister should regard Pakistan's decision to strengthen herself militarily "as a ground for not proceeding with the implementation of the agreement embodied in our joint communique."

Comments. Suspicion prevails that behind the scenes "hidden hands" have been operating. Perhaps the Big-Powers have their own petty advantages with a view to keep the dispute alive. Perhaps they do not solve the Kashmir Problem because of the drifting sands of the balances of power in view of the collapse of Chiang Kai-shek's China.

Kashmir may be an important point in Anglo-American overall global strategy against Russia.

In spite of Pakistan's steadfast loyalty to the Commonwealth, Britain passed all these years in telling us of Indian arguments and by pointing our arguments to the Indians just to keep the dispute alive.

American attitude on the Kashmir Issue appeared to have registered a noticeable change. American dollars began to rain abundantly on the Indian soil and American capital for long-term investment was made available. The Anglo-American bloc is not prepared to displease India. Instead of solving the Kashmir Problem they adopted a policy of delay, indecision and appeasement which has gone a long way to make India stiff and highly unreasonable on the Kashmir Issue.

"The most dispassionate study of the career of the dispute in the Security Council proves calculated evasion and drift and appeasement of aggression on the part of the Anglo-Saxon Powers."

There appear to be two different international scales of justice, one for general international issues—which is majority of votes—and the other, not based on majority votes— applying only to the issues concerning the Muslims as we find in the case of Palestine, Kashmir and other such like problems.

Free and impartial plebiscite alone can lead to a just solution of the Kashmir Problem. Sardar Muhammad Ibrahim Khan, ex-President of the Azad Kashmir Government, believed that "we are subject to an international conspiracy. United Nations has tried to foster belief in the minds of the people of Kashmir and Pakistan that a solution of Kashmir can still emerge from the effort of this international organisation so that we tenaciously cling to the UN and do nothing which would embarrass the United Nations Powers in its international and global strategy. The United Nations wants to have India on its side because in the South-East Asian strategy, the Indian sub-continent will certainly be exploited if an east-west war breacks out. Therefore,

India knows fully well that the Anglo-American bloc will not antagonise India on any issue, much less on Kashmir while Kashmir Issue is being dallied with by the United Nations with the assistance of India. India has definitely tried to create internal problems for Pakistan which surely can undermine the whole State. As, for example, the language controversy in east Bengal is a good proof of the forces at work underneath. The language question is not purely indigenous to East Bengal but has its support abroad. This is done to divert the attention of Pakistan's people from the Kashmir Issue and weaken Pakistan so that she not only gives up the Kashmir struggle but also comes under the tutelage of India in South-East Asia. All this is done under a well-planned scheme."

Moscow Comments. Soviet Union charged Britain and the United States with deliberately and consistently preventing a solution of the Kashmir Dispute with the object of turning the disputed region into a trust territory and using it for an "imperialist base," against Soviet Union and China.

India's Bid to Buy Kashmir. A special correspondent of *The London Times* in Kashmir wrote in July, 1955 an article under the caption "India's Grip on Kashmir". He said that in a free and fair plebiscite sixty per cent Kashmiris would vote for union with Pakistan and the remainder for India. ". . . .In its present mood, Delhi will not agree to a plebiscite being held. The policy behind the aid programme is clear: "if the hearts and minds of Kashmir cannot be won, a determined effort must be made to buy them." Indians seem to see little wrong in this policy of political stone-walling and laid with strings." The aid programme from India to India-held Kashmir is regarded as a demonstration of the advantages of union with India."

"Indian aid is munificent, far more in comparison than American aid to India. . . . . The approximate total is £13,500,000 (*i. e.*, Rs. 180 crores) for 44 million people, a not inconsiderable sum for a country also dependent upon foreign aid for many of its development projects. Apart from direct aid, tens of millions of rupees are being spent by

India on the improvement of the Pathankot Road and services taken over by the Indian authorities. . . . . ever custom duty at Indian ports on imported goods is returned to the State in the form of an annual grant. The maintenance of Indian army in the State also brings in millions of rupees. . . . . .Aid is strictly a political operation with very obvious strings." The goal of Indian policy is to reduce the opposition in numbers through aid. If this goal is reached, then only dangerously bad relations with Pakistan will remain. . . ."

India No Longer Stands by Plebiscite Pledge. On July 9, 1955, India's Home Minister, Pandit Govind Valabh Pant, announced in unequivocal terms in Srinagar that India no longer stood by her pledge of a plebiscite in Kashmir. He said: "We made certain statements when Kashmir acceded to India, but when we made those statements, circumstances were different from what they are now. The time factor is very important. Many things have happened since then."

He had also declared that since the decision on the accession issue taken by the Srinagar "Constituent Assembly" was final and irrevocable, there was no question of Kashmir going away from India and that as to the only other way—the forces of bayonets— it could not go by that way either.

The Indian Prime Minister Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru confirmed in the Lok Sabha on August 5, 1955, that Pant's statements on the future of Kashmir were "consistent" with the policy of the Government of India. "We cannot ignore the changing world . . . .", he said.

India was reported to have sent more troops to the Azad Kashmir-Occupied Kashmir border. It was reported that before the statement given by the Bharati Home Minister, Pandit Pant, the Bharati Army had started concentrating along the border and strengthened their positions.

Pandit Pant's utterances shocked and distressed those who had never ceased hoping that Indo-Pakistan relations

would one day "emerge from mutual distrust and inveterate bitterness into correctness and cordiality.

A "No Plebiscite in Kashmir" campaign was designed to serve three purposes ;

1. To strengthen the hands of the Bakhshi regime in Occupied Kashmir which leans heavily on the Government of India and to dishearten the vast anti-India section of the population there;

2. To create an impression that, along with other sections of the population in India, the Muslims are also solidly behind the Kashmir policy of the Government of India; or

3. To indicate to Pakistan that India is not in a mood to settle this question.

All-Parties Conference on Kashmir. The All-Parties Conference on Kashmir began towards the end of November, 1955. Top-ranking leaders of the various political parties including the minorities represented all sections of public opinion. It discussed the Kashmir Issue to evolve a plan to solve the complicated top-priority problem.

Policy of Pakistan. For Pakistan, Kashmir is of grave national importance. The longer is solution is delayed the more it agitates the minds of the people and the greater grows its importance.

Although fully alive to the first-rate importance of a just solution of Kashmir Problem, the Government of Pakistan continue to hold that the Kashmir Question needs to be decided in a cooler atmosphere and that the solution must be a peaceful one. Pakistan's case about Kashmir is very strong.

India Refuses Plebiscite in Kashmir. On March 29, 1956 the Indian Prime Minister, Mr. Jawahar Lal Nehru said in Lok Sabha that legally and constitutionally Kashmir had acceded to India and, therefore, it became India's duty to protect Kashmir from aggression and to drive out the invaders. He declared, "All this talk of a plebiscite is

completely beside the point," for many new developments and changes had taken place during the previous eight years or so."

Pandit Nehru listed the charges that had taken place during the last eight years, as the U. S. military aid to Pakistan, the economic development of the State (Occupied Kashmir) and the coming into being there (Occupied Kashmir) of the Constituent Assembly, Pakistan's membership of the Baghdad Pact and the SEATO were stated to have increased danger to Bharat. Therefore, all old things about plebiscite became out of date.

On April 13, 1956, the Prime Minister of Bharat said in a public meeting that he had suggested to Pakistan that the Kashmir Problem should be solved on the basis of the existing cease-fire line after mutual discussions.

Views of Pakistan. The ex-Prime Minister, Mr. Muhammad Ali described the reported offer of Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru to settle the Kashmir Dispute on the basis of the present cease-fire line as a 'preposterous proposal'. He said, "The people of Kashmir are not goods and chattels which could be divided amongst India and Pakistan by the latter's agreeing on a partition of the State, as proposed by the Indian Prime Minister. The people of Kashmir demand the right of self-determination. They are bound to secure this right, however much the Indian Prime Minister may resist it."

Bharat had been perpetrating acts of violence in order to provoke and embarrass Pakistan. The idea behind border raids was apparently to impress the United States and Britain that the explosive situation existed on Pak-Bharat frontiers, and consequently they were playing with fire by giving arms aid to Pakistan.

Mr. Muhammad Ali stated that continuation of direct negotiations with Bharat "no longer holds any prospect" of settlement of the Kashmir Dispute and "this Dispute must now be referred to the Security Council." He rejected Pandit Nehru's statement that Pakistan's associations with

SEATO and Baghdad Pact and US military aid amounted to a threat to Bharat and that it had changed the position of the Kashmir Dispute. He said, "Bharat had tried in the past to divert our attention from the Kashmir Question by inciting communal trouble in Bengal and to bully Pakistan by amassing armed forces against Pakistan." The same aggressive steps are being adopted by Bharat today. Apart from several border incidents that have taken place in quick succession, which are an evidence of Bharat's aggressive designs against Pakistan, it was reported that Bharat was planning to settle more non-Muslims in Kashmir and drive out its Muslim population in order to reduce it to an ineffective minority in the State.

Following Mr. Nehru's announcement that plebiscite has largely become out of question now, Pakistan decided to report to the Security Council the failure of direct negotiations.

World Press Views. The fortnightly *Free Thinker* of Delhi in an April issue criticised Nehru's stand on Kashmir as "definitely incompatible with promises of plebiscite". The journal said editorially that Mr. Nehru's contention that the State had acceded to Bharat did not stand scrutiny as the 'Assembly' was not an elected body and did not support an iota of popular support. Mr. Nehru's denial against the solution of the dispute for reasons of Pakistan's membership of pacts and her getting military aid from the USA was unintelligible. The journal further observed: "So long as the country remains deprived of freedom and liberty, it cannot make any substantial progress in any fields."

An Urdu weekly, *Naya Payam* of Delhi said that in view of the fact that armies of the two countries were facing each other in Kashmir, Mr. Nehru's claim that by ruling out the plebiscite he would solve the Kashmir Issue was "patently absurd". So long as the Kashmiris were not allowed their right of self-determination Mr. Nehru's dream of ending uncertainty in Kashmir would never come true, the weekly said.

U. K. Press sharply criticised Mr. Nehru on his Kashmir statements. The *Manchester Guardian* said that "Mr. Nehru can hardly complain if there is a new burst of excitement over Kashmir. His remarks have been provocative." To *Daily Telegraph* it was "depressing to find Mr. Nehru appealing to the authority of Messrs. Bulganin and Khurshchev to support his claim to Kashmir." "In all his policies Mr. Nehru has shown a tendency to speak in two voices. In one role he is a strong man, the leader of the Congress Party under which India was unified, which demanded—and obtained—the accession of the powerful princely States and which is now preferred to rattle sabres against Goa, Kashmir and Pakistan herself. In the other, he is the heir of mystic Gandhi and of his policies of passive resistance."

The Delhi carrespondent of the London *Times* put the blame for war hysteria in Bharat on the shoulders of the Bharati Press because day after day it printed flaring headlines announcing each border incident as a new "Pakistan's aggression", and freely hinted fears of attack by Pakistan with that country's membership of SEATO and receipts of arms aid from the west.

Al-Hayat, an influential daily of Beirut, said that Bharat refused to honour Security Council's resolutions for holding a plebiscite in Kashmir "because she knows well that its result will not be in her favour, since the population is over-whelmingly Muslim and will accede to no other country but Pakistan." The paper added that Bharat occupied Kashmir by force and is running it as if it were a Bharati State. The paper concluded: "Bharat is losing confidence of the world opinion because in resorting to force she does not so differ from those imperialist powers that aim at colonization and aggrandisement."

Draft Constitution for Occupied Kashmir. The draft of the Occupied Kashmir's constitution presented to the Srinagar 'Assembly' on October 10, 1956 aimed at "legalising the occupation of Kashmir by Bharat and continuation of this occupation."

The draft constitution laid down that no amendment should be moved to Occupied Kashmir's affiliation as the "state is and shall always remain part of India." It also provided that no amendment should be applicable in respect of the application of Bharati laws and Bharati Constitution to the Occupied Kashmir. Another significant provision in the draft was that the Head of State with the concurrence of the President of Bharat, could suspend the constitution whole or in part, for a period of six months.

The draft, it was said, claimed to extend itself to a territories of the ex-Maharaja of Kashmir at the time of Partition of the subcontinent.

A bicameral legislature was envisaged in the draft. The Lower House, to be called the Legislative Assembly, was to have 100 members to be elected on the basis of adult suffrage by permanent residents of the State. Twenty-four seats would be left vacant for the population of Azad Kashmir, in the hope that Bharati occupation would in due course extend to that area. The Upper House to be called the Legislative Council would be elected by the Legislative Assembly and teachers and local bodies. It would have 36 members. Thirty would be elected—15 by Jammu and 15 by Kashmir. The remaining six members would be nominated by the Head of the State who would be called Sadr-i-Riyasat.

The Head of the State would be elected by a majority vote.

Draft Constitution Wholly Unacceptable to Kashmiri People. The draft of the Occupied Kashmir's constitution presented to the 'Assembly' was wholly unacceptable to Kashmiri people as stated by the Working Committee of the Kashmiri Democratic Union. An appeal was made to the Government of India to inquire into the "sorry state of affairs and to end this rule by terroristic methods." Resolution on the draft constitution said : "The draft is reactionary, undemocratic and servile and its framers enjoy absolutely no representative character, and have no

mandate or authority from the people of the State. Only a Constituent Assembly elected through democratic methods, can frame constitution.

Kashmir Case Back at UNO. On January 2, 1957, Pakistan officially asked for a meeting of the UN Security Council at the "earliest convenience" of the members to discuss the the Kashmir Question. Pakistan's decision to refer the case of Kashmir Dispute back to UNO appeared to some a long delayed step and a rather belated recognition of realities. The request to convene a meeting of Security Council was made in a letter to the Council President by Malik Firoz Khan Noon, the then Foreign Minister of Pakistan.

The latter recalled the UNCIP Resolutions dated 13th August, 1948, and 5th January, 1949, whereunder the question of the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India or Pakistan was to be decided by means of a free and impartial plebiscite to be held under the auspices of the UN. Dr. Frank P. Graham, the UN representative for India and Pakistan, expressed the hope that "instead of the United Nations representative continuing to report difference to the Security Council, may assume the leadership of over 400 million people with the goodwill and assistance of the United Nations, join in negotiating and reporting an agreement on Kashmir and thereby light a torch along the difficult path of the people's pilgrimage towards peace". Pakistan upholding the prestige and authority of the United Nations accepted the UN representative's suggestion and initiated direct negotiations with the Government of India with a view to resolving differences which were holding up implementation of the aforesaid international agreement. But during all this time the Government of India refused, on one pretext or another, to honour their international commitments which they accepted under the two above-mentioned UNCIP Resolutions. Statements made by the Indian Prime Minister in the Indian Parliament on March 29, 1956, and a Press Conference on 2nd April, 1956, as well as his subsequent public

utterances and the steps that the so-called " Constituent Assembly" of Kashmir had taken in collusion with the Government of India in regard to future disposition of the State in direct contravention of the Security Council's resolution of 30th March, 1951, further forced Pakistan to the conclusion that continuance of direct negotiation between the Governments of Pakistan and India held out no prospect of settlement of this dispute.

On the other hand, the Indian Prime Minister's declaration regarding opposition to a plebiscite accompanied by the steps that were being taken by the Government of India unilaterally to "integrate" the State with India in utter disregard to the assurance given by the Government to the Security Council and the mounting unrest both inside and outside Kashmir, had combined to create an explosive situation which constituted serious threat to peace in the area. If the disputes pending in the Security Council for over nine years were not resolved immediately, the faith of the people inside and outside Kashmir would be shaken in the ability of the UN to secure international justice, and gravest consequences might ensue.

The Government of Pakistan, therefore, felt that the situation called for a firm and timely action by the Security Council. The UNCIP Resolutions dated 13th August 1948, and 5th January, 1949, which constituted an international agreement between India and Pakistan that the question of the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India or Pakistan would be decided by means of a free and impartial plebiscite under the United Nations auspices, were urged to be implemented without delay.

Four-Power Resolution on Kashmir. On February 14, 1957, Britain formally submitted to the United Nations Security Council a Four - Power resolution calling on Mr Gunnar V. Jarring, of Sweden, to consult the Indian and Pakistan Governments on the Kashmir Dispute. The resolution was co-sponsored by Britain, Australia, Cuba and the United States. The resolutions gave Sweden's Gunnar Jarring wide terms of reference; to examine proposals which were likely to contribute to the achieve-

ment of demilitarisation or "to the establishment of other conditions of progress toward the settlement of the Disputr is also to keep in mind United Nations' Resolution, statements by India, and Pakistan and the proposal for the use of a temporary United Nations force" Mr. Jarring was authorised to visit the sub-continent and report not later than April 15, 1957. Both Mr. Dag Hammarskjoeld and Mr. Graham were requested to render him assistance.

Russian Veto. On February 20, 1957, the Soviet Union vetoed the Four-Power resolution inviting the President of the United Nations Security Council, Sweden's Mr. Gunnar Jarring to go to India and Pakistan to attempt a settlement of the Kashmir Problem.

The ex-President of Azad Kashmir Government, Sardar Abdul Qayyum Khan, commenting on the Soviet veto said in Muzaffarabad on February 21, 1957, that Pakistan-Bharat tension suited Russian strategy of infiltration. It was only unrest and conflict, he added, that Communism strived for.

New Resolution. The United States, Britain and Australia submitted a new resolution immediately after Russia had used its so-called veto to block the original measure. The new resolution repeated the proposals likely to contribute to a settlement of the Kashmir Dispute.

The following is the text of the second draft resolution presented in the Security Council by Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States:

" The Security Council recalling its resolution of 24th January, 1957, its previous resolutions and the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan on the Indo-Pakistan question —

1. Requests the President of the Security Council, the Representative of Sweden, to examine with the Governments of India and Pakistan any proposals which, in his opinion, are likely to contribute towards the settlement of the Dispute, having regard to the previous resolutions of the Security Council and of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan—to visit the sub-continent for this

purpose—and to report to the Security Council not later than 15th April, 1957.

2. Invites the Governments of India and Pakistan to co-operate with him in the performance of these functions—and

3. Requests the Secretary-General and the United Nations' Representative for India and Pakistan to render such assistance as he may request.

Jarring Report on Kashmir. As directed in the Security Council resolution adopted on February 21, 1957, the United Nations Representative for Kashmir, Mr. Gunnar V. Jarring (the U.N. representative of Sweden) visited India and Pakistan in March-April, 1957. He reported failure of his mission to Bharat and Pakistan under a Security Council mandate. The report was submitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on April 29, 1957. Mr. Jarring revealed that Pakistan had accepted but Bharat had rejected his suggestion to submit for arbitration whether or not Part I of the UNCIP Resolution of August 13, 1948 had been implemented.

The report stated that discussions were held by Mr. Jarring with both the Governments. He made a number of suggestions to both the Governments. During his conversations, the Government of India laid particular emphasis on the fact that, in their view, two factors stood in the way of implementation of the two UNCIP Resolutions. "The first of these was that Part I of the resolution of August 13, 1948, and in particular sections B and E had, in their view, not been implemented by the Government of Pakistan. The second of these impediments, which concerned rather Part II of the first resolution, was that the Government of India, which had brought the case before Security Council on January 1, 1948, felt aggrieved that the Council had so far not expressed itself on the question of what in their view was aggression committed by Pakistan or India." Mr. Jarring explained to the Government of India that the Security Council had properly taken cognisance of their original complaint. The Government of Pakistan maintained

that Part I of the first resolution had been implemented in good faith and in full by them and the time had come to proceed to the implementation of Part II.

In order to break the deadlock concerning Part I of the Resolution, Mr. Jarring inquired of the two Governments if they would be prepared to submit the question, whether Part I had been implemented or not, to arbitration. The Jarring Report said, "While the Government of Pakistan, after it certain hesitation, fell in with my suggestion in principle, the Government of India, however, did not feel that arbitration, as outlined by me, would be appropriate."

Comments. The veteran Kashmiri leader Chaudhri Ghulam Abbas Khan said on May 1, 1958, that some parts of the report of Mr. Jarring were not only "mischievous in the meaning and import" but were also "much partial and definitely hostile to Pakistan." He could never visualise such a "hopeless and disappointing document by a person like Mr. Jarring," Ch. Ghulam Abbas added.

JARRING "FAILED". The *New York Times* said on May 3, 1957, that the United Nations Report by Mr. Gunnar Jarring, of Sweden, on Kashmir could be summed up in one word—'failure'. The leading article quoted the report as saying that Bharat "did not feel that arbitrations as outlined by me (Mr. Jarring) would be appropriate. It was held by New Delhi to be inconsistent with the rights and obligations of the Union of India in respect of the territory."

The *New York Times* said: "What this really means, of course, is that Bharat regards the case as closed."

It is not subject to arbitrament. The Security Council had previously authorised a free plebiscite as the proper means of settling the political status of the disputed area. This was blocked by Bharat which then proceeded to 'incorporate' the territory without any submission of its status to a free vote of the Kashmiris. "The issue was, and still is, whether the Kashmiris are to be allowed to determine their political future in a free election." "What is at stake is not Pakistan's body of commitment. It is Government of the

Kashmiris by consent of the Kashmiris. Bharat has refused to put this to the test." Pakistan is willing. "Mr. Jarring has failed, but this failure does not absolve the Security Council of its responsibility." "This case cannot thus be closed if the United Nations is to preserve its prestige and its self-respect," observed the *New York Times*.

"Delhi has now started campaigning for a move to entrust to the International Court the legal aspect of the State's accession to India. How does this accord with the solemn pledges given by the Bharati Government to the Security Council that the Kashmiris themselves should decide the future of the State?" And if the International Court were, in any case, to decide against Bharat, who then is to enforce the decision? Following Bharat's recent defiance of the Security Council, a tendency to relax and evade the Issue has become noticeable in the United Nations. "But the UN will soon be called upon to act upon Mr. Jarring's Report. It can be said now that nothing can be more dangerous than to put this Dispute in cold storage." After its reverses in the Suez Canal dispute, the United Nations can allow its will to be flouted again only at a serious cost of its dwindling prestige and effectiveness It cannot keep on adopting its code of conduct to appease the unappeasable, to mollify the offender or to placate the powerful.

India's Stand on Kashmir. It was reported on March 18, 1957, that on the eve of the arrival of UN Mediator, Gunnar Jarring, the Indian President Rajendra Prasad outlining the Indian Cabinet's policy before the joint session of Parliament which met on that day said: "Jammu and Kashmir State is and has been a constituent State of the Indian Union since October 1947, like other States which acceded to the Union."

The Prime Minister, Pandit Nehru was also reported to have told the Congress Parliamentary Party that their stand on "Kashmir was based upon uncompromising opposition to the two-nation theory propounded by the Muslim League (defunct)." The Prime Minister added, according to a

report : "We are not going to be guided by this theory. We have opposed and will continue to oppose it. Our whole stand on Kashmir is to oppose this theory."

Amplifying India's stand *vis-a-vis* Azad Kashmir, Mr. Nehru argued on March 25, 1957, that it was the whole State of Jammu and Kashmir which had acceded to India and therefore Azad Kashmir also formed part of India.

Hindu Migration to Kashmir Facilitated. It was reported on August 25, 1957, that the Government of India was encouraging Hindus to settle in Kashmir with loans and rehabilitation grants. 'The settlers in Kashmir got loans and rehabilitation grants totalling to some Rs. 6,000 each. They also got an amount of Rs. 1,900 each on their arrival in Kashmir and later on they were granted business loans and other grants.

It was reported on May 8, 1957, that the Plebiscite Front in Kashmir had expressed its "alarm and grave concern" on Kashmir being included in the North Zonal Council, an Indian merger plan, to end Kashmir's entity and individuality and to reduce its Muslim majority to an insignificant minority in the Zone's total population of over 40 million.

Bharat Built up Air Bases in Kashmir. It was reported on June 6, 1957, that Bharat was building its Air Force and chain of air bases were being built in various parts of the country. A whole string of occupied air-fields was being developed in the north-eastern region of Bharat in Occupied Kashmir and Ladakh. The Bharatis were developing a new air-field in the north-eastern region of Bharat in Occupied Kashmir and Ladakh. The Bharatis, it was reported, were developing a new air-field in the north-eastern frontier parts in order to be able to establish a shorter air route for linking Lhasa with Calcutta. Similarly, in the Ladakh region construction of a military base was going on. The air-field was renovated and expanded and was capable of receiving fairly large sized civil and military aircraft.

India's Protest Against Mangla Dam Project. On August 21, 1957, India protested to the United Nations Security Council over the Mangla Dam Project of the President of the Security Council the Indian Ambassador said, execution of the project was "a further instance of consolidation by the Government of Pakistan of their authority over the Indian territory of Jammu and Kashmir which they continue to occupy by force." He said the Government continued "the exploitation of the resources of the territory to the disadvantage of the people of Jammu and Kashmir and for the benefit of the people of Pakistan."

Bakhshi Ghulam Mohammad, commenting on Mangla Dam Project said, Kashmir had never renounced her right to parts of "her territories now under illegal occupation of Pakistan and the cease-fire line dividing the State was not a permanent demarcating line of the State borders."

Referring to the Indian letter of August 21, 1957, about the Mangla Dam Project in Azad Kashmir, Pakistan's permanent representative to the United Nations told the President of the Security Council on October 4, 1957, that if measures recently carried out by India in India-held Kashmir cannot be deemed to aggravate the situation in terms of the resolution of 1948, the Government of Pakistan fails to understand how a development measure undertaken in Azad Kashmir such as the Mangla Dam Project executed by Pakistan and the Azad Kashmir authorities could be described as a violation of the resolution.

Kashmir "Drifting Towards an Explosion." Elizabeth Partridge in the *News Chronicle* from New Delhi said in September 1957, that Kashmir seemed to be drifting towards an explosion. "Tension has mounted to breaking point in Kashmir, that fairy land of lakes and lotuses which is the cause of dissension between India and Pakistan." "Warning of danger" is the unhappy keynote of Kashmir. "There is a grave risk of another dash, because tension is increasing as India buys surplus British arms to catch up with her neighbour's American arms aid."

"India has plenty of trouble in Kashmir. Until now India's puppet Prime Minister, Bakhshi Ghulam Mohammad

has ruled with an ungloved iron hand. Because of the continuing emergency—at least two crack Indian divisions are still guarding Kashmir—civil liberties have been increasingly crushed." Now for the first time Bakhshi faces tough internal opposition and a great deal of his dirty linen is about to be washed in public. A section of his party, led by G. M. Sadiq and D. H. Dhar, has broken away to form their own party, accusing Bakhshi of corruption, nepotism and loss of freedom. Miss Mridula Sarabhai detailed in an Urdu newspaper of Jammu the rape outrages frequently perpetrated by sex maniacs in the Indian Military and Central Reserve Police. "Not only the National Conference rank-and-file but also the high ups in the party who are today the rulers of the State indulge in such activities," she stated.

UN Debate on Kashmir. The Kashmir case came up again to the Security Council on September 24, 1957. Pakistan's Foreign Minister told the Security Council that Pakistan was willing to withdraw her forces from the cease-fire line in Jammu and Kashmir, provided a strong United Nations Force occupied the area and provided India reduced her forces to the level prescribed by the Security Council in its resolution of December 23, 1952.

Dr. Graham's Report. Dr. Graham visited India and Pakistan in February 1958. His report to the President of the Security Council was released in Pakistan on April 3, 1958. The report was divided into 7 parts and contained 13 pages. The report described in brief Dr. Graham's terms of reference and outlines of the dates and manner of his discussions with the Governments of India and Pakistan. His formal recommendations, which he finally made to the two Governments on February 15, 1958 included consideration of the possibility of a renewed declaration in accord with the 1948 declaration, to report the integrity of the cease-fire line, possibility of stationing of a UN force on the Pakistan side of the Pakistan and Kashmir border, need for an early agreement between the two Governments on the interpretation that should be placed on Part III of August 13, 1948 resolution.

Pakistan Accepted Recommendations. Dr. Graham mentioned in Part V of the report that the Government of Pakistan accepted each and every one of his proposals in principle while the Government of India rejected these all.

India Rejected. With regard to the recommendations on the stationing of a United Nations force on the Pakistan side of Jammu and Kashmir border, the Government of India expressed adverse views. She considered it as highly improper and indeed an unfriendly act to promote a suggestion which would involve the stationing of foreign troops in neighbouring sovereign state. The Government of India also did not like to discuss the view that there was need for an early agreement between the two Governments on the interpretation of 1948 resolutions. "The Government of India declared themselves unable to agree to my recommendations. They based their position on the grounds that my recommendations were made without regard to failure to implement the Security Council resolution of January 17, 1948, and clauses (*b*) and (*e*) of Part I of the UNCIP Resolution of August 13, 1948, for which they held Pakistan responsible. In their view, the sole onus of performance was on Pakistan and the United Nations, which has both the responsibility and capacity, for taking steps towards a peaceful approach to the situation and for making a contribution to resolving difficulties between India and Pakistan.

"While, therefore, the inability of India to accept my recommendations primarily followed from their contention that my approach was not feasible since, in their view, it intended to bypass the implementation of what they considered to be the preliminary question, they also informed me that they did not look with favour on the substance of my recommendations.

Thus they felt that a new declaration regarding a peaceful atmosphere and cease-fire line might denote a displacement of previous engagements. They further contended that such a declaration would imply that Pakistan had not violated their previous engagements and that the consequence of them would thereby stand condemned.

"The Government of India could also not see their way to accept the stand I had recommended in my third recommendation as they felt that it would tend to bypass and evade what they considered to be the main issue, namely, illegal occupation of Indian Union territory by Pakistan.

"In their view that territory was an integral and inseparable part of the Union of India and the recommendation was based on a misconception that Jammu and Kashmir were a no-man's land. Further study in their view would not be-relevant since according to UNCIP resolutions and assurances given on behalf of the Security Council to the Government of India they alone, with the UN, were concerned in this matter and Pakistan would not seem to have any place whatsoever in these arrangements."

Abdullah's Release and Rearrest. On January 8, 1958, after 4½ years of detention in jail without trial Sheikh Abdullah was released. Since his release from jail, Sheikh Abdullah was staunchly demanding a free plebiscite in the State to determine its final destiny. He said that he was not prepared to recast his views on Kashmir's constitutional destiny and had emphasised that the whole problem of Jammu and Kashmir had to be left to the people themselves for solution.

Kashmir Liberation Movement (K.L.M.). The convention of the Central Kashmir Liberation Committee decided in their meeting on June 15, 1958, to launch a peaceful crossing into the India-held Kashmir from the 9th of Zilhaj, *i.e.*, one day before Id-ul-Azha (June 27, 1958). It was resolved to continue it till their noble end was achieved. The resolution emphasised that the movement would be strictly peaceful and hoped that the people would not be provoked to violence.

The resolution stated in detail the origin of the Dispute, what led to the stalemate and how India had always blocked a peaceful settlement of the Dispute. It also blamed the UN Security Council for appeasing India. It also criticised the Government of Pakistan for having failed to pursue a vigorous and strong policy in securing the right of self-determination for the Kashmiris. The resolution also

condemned India for reducing the State to an armed camp and unleashing a reign of terror on the helpless people, unknown in history. Ch. Ghulam Abbas had earlier declared: "No force on earth can stop Kashmir from breaking the cease-fire line."

The Government of former West Pakistan arrested Ch. Ghulam Abbas Khan while he was on his way towards crossing the cease-fire line on June 27, 1958, according to the programme chalked out by the Kashmir Liberation Movement of Azad Kashmir people. In spite of the arrest and strong precautionary measures taken by the Pakistan and Azad Kashmir Governments several hundred volunteers were reported to have assembled at Chinari to cross peacefully the cease-fire line on June 27, 1958. By July 10, 1958, seven of the top leaders of the Movement were reported to have been arrested besides over 1,200 volunteers. The K. L. M. volunteers continued to cross the cease-fire line and the Movement was kept up by its next leaders. All the K. L. M. leaders were released by the New Regime in Pakistan.

All the leaders of the Occupied Kashmir are perpetually demanding free plebiscite. Even hardships in jails do not shake their determination. Some of them had died in jails offering life sacrifices for the freedom of their beloved country from the clutches of Indian tyranny.

Pakistan and Kashmir Problem. Pakistan is specifically particular about the liberation of Kashmir.

Chapter 5

TOWARDS SECOND JIHAD CAMPAIGN FOR LIBERATION OF KASHMIR

May 8, 1965. There was firing in Srinagar, as a result of which 8 persons were killed and 396 were arrested. The arrest of Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah caused mass protest. In the following four-days there was fresh firing in which more persons were killed. Popular defiance continued.

May 17. Rallies and *Hartals* continued in Held-Kashmir area. India embarking on aggressive policy attacked and occupied three Pakistani posts in Kargil. Pakistan had lodged a complaint against that aggression.

May 19. Indian attack in a battalion strength on three Pakistani posts in Gultari Sector was repulsed.

May 28. India poured in more troops into Occupied Kashmir. Pakistan asked India to see reason and give up its aggressive plans. She urged India to settle the disputes through peaceful means.

June. In the month of June 1965 more bitterness between India and *Mujahideen-i-Islam* in Kashmir ensued. More arrests were made in Held-Kashmir, civil disobedience spread in the area. On June 12, a protest was lodged with the United Nations against the continued occupation of Kargil posts.

On June 27, the Action Committee in Srinagar demanded early plebiscite in the Valley. At the instance of the United Nations India vacated Kargil posts, but left behind mine fields.

July. Plebiscite Front in Srinagar requested India to respect the will of the people. In order to press their

demands mass rallies continued. There were also food riots in Held-Kashmir, India opened fire as a result of which 27 persons were killed and 60 were arrested. The Holy Relic Action Committee in Srinagar lodged a protest against repression in Held-Kashmir.

Plebiscite Front called for strike on August 5, 1965. It was also decided on that day to make demonstrations on August 9, to demand self-determination.

Establishment of Revolutionary Council in Held-Kashmir and its Efforts for Freedom Struggle. It was just an accident in history that a predominantly Muslim State should have been ruled by a Hindu Maharaja. It is an irony of fate that Kashmir which produced such distinguished persons as Dr. Muhammad Iqbal, Poet of the East, Gama, the world Champion in Wrestling, should continue to suffer untold humiliation, inhuman hardships, tyranny and repression under the coward Hindu Dogra regime.

The people of Kashmir finding that India has been flouting United Nations resolutions on Kashmir for the past so many weary years, although she had committed herself before the nations of the world to let the Kashmiris decide their own future through a plebiscite, could no longer bear Indian attitude and oppression. Hence, on August 9, 1965, a Revolutionary Council of the people of Jammu and Kashmir was formed in Occupied Kashmir. The struggle for the liberation of Kashmir, with the establishment of this Council, entered a crucial stage. The main objective of the Revolutionary Council is to liberate Occupied Kashmir of the aggression and tyranny of Indian imperialism and to win for the Kashmiris their right of self-determination pledged to them long ago in the resolutions of the United Nations of August 13, 1947 and January 1, 1948.

On August 10, 1965, the "*Sada-i-Kashmir*" radio declared that Kashmiri *Mujahids* were depending on the help of Allah alone.

The "*Sada-i-Kashmir*" announced that the people of Kashmir were ready to sacrifice their lives for their motherland. The radio said that for the past so many years, the people of Kashmir had waited for fairplay but all of their hopes were belied and no alternative was left for them but to take action themselves to decide their future. The *Sada-i-Kashmir* expressing the will of their people said, "We are not afraid of Indian military might. The things has gone too far. The goal of freedom is in sight. The Indians want us to remain slaves. We shall never allow them to do so. We know the freedom struggle needs blood and the motherland will not find us wanting".

The Revolutionary Council appealed to the British Government and the people, to support in the name of humanity and democracy, the cause of the *Mujahids* in Held-Kashmir. The Council expected in its appeal that at this time of trial when the people of the Occupied Kashmir had risen in revolt against Indian oppression, the British would help the freedom-fighters.

The "*Sada-i-Kashmir*" radio in its broadcast of August 19, 1965 appealed to the moral conscience of the United States and the Soviet Union. In its appeal to the Soviet Union it said : "You who declared yourself the messenger of peace in the world, we are in bondage for the last 200 years. The Valley of Kashmir, which is known as a paradise on the earth, is no longer a paradise. It is a hell infested by poverty, hunger and disease. India is sucking the blood of this Valley and thriving on it. What would you have done had you been in our place? In the name of justice, humanity and peace, we appeal to you to help us light the torch of freedom in this Valley, to rid ourselves of the neo-imperialism of India. You, the disciples of Lenin, should know India has been rediculing our aspirations for the last so many years. It has been treating us as a flock of sheep. These are the very imperialistic characteristics which Russia has condemned all along. Now give us your moral help in breaking these chains. We are not the enemies of India, but we are also not enemies of freedom, which India has denied us. We love freedom as

any other people as our birthright. We warn you that India is no one's friend-least of all yours. It is a selfish and hypocritical country observed by the desire to dominate others with the strength of arms borrowed from different countries".

In an appeal to the United States of America it said : "You could deploy your army against Hitler in support of the democratic powers. Then why not for the downtrodden Kashmiris? It is your moral duty to help them secure their right of self-determination".

The Revolutionary Council in its broadcast of August 28, 1965 declared that the Indian efforts to rush more reinforcement to the Occupied Kashmir would not save the tottering Indian imperialist regime in the Valley from its defeats at the hands of the brave *Mujahideen*. The Council in a message said that the day, when the Kashmiris would gain their independence, was not far off.

The Revolutionary Council asked the people of Kashmir to exert pressure on the Indian occupationary armies who were already fleeing. The Indian coward forces were surprised and harassed at the lighting action of the *Mujahids* in attacking their headquarters. The Council re-affirmed its determination of Kashmiris to continue their struggle with full determination and faith in Allah.

The Kashmir Revolutionary Council had declared on September 5, 1965 that the Muslims of Kashmir were determined to continue their struggle for freedom till the complete victory is achieved. Referring to the U.N. Security Councils call for cease-fire, the Council said that the Kashmiri Muslims were not bound by any agreement of cease-fire. The people of Kashmir who are more than half crore do not want to be hoodwinked once again by the American-Controlled United Nations which had not made any sincere efforts towards their genuine case.

The Kashmiri Muslims on September 7, 1965, reiterated through their representative Revolutionary Council that they were resolved to gain independence of their country even at the cost of heavy sacrifices.

On September 9, 1965, the Kashmir Revolutionary Council has thanked Indonesia, Turky, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Algeria, China and others for assuring active help to Pakistan in meeting Indian aggression against her territory. The Council remarked that the Indian imperialists in Kashmir had mounted a treacherous attack on Pakistan in order to punish her for her support to the people of Jammu and Kashmir in their struggle for independence. The Council hoped that every country supporting these universal principles would unite its resources and support vacate aggression.

On September 10, 1965, the Revolutionary Council rejected the Cease-Fire Agreement. The people of Kashmir praised the valour of the Pakistan Armed Forces and remarked that Pakistan's spectacular victories over India were something unprecedented. The Council also paid glowing tributes to the brave *Mujahids*.

The voice of Kashmir, on October 8, 1965, reaffirmed the determination of the Kashmiri Muslims to oust all Indian forces from their motherland. It appealed that both India and Pakistan should withdraw their forces from the State and the Kashmiris should pull out their forces from the State so as to enable them to exercise their birthright of self-determination.

On November 6, 1965, the Revolutionary Council has reiterated her stand for plebiscite in Kashmir.

It was learnt on November 7, 1965 that India had prepared a new scheme to suppress the Movement of freedom of the State. The Revolutionary Council said that according to the new plan all educated Muslims of the Valley were being scattered in India on the pretex that they would be promoted on better prospects. The Muslim officials of the Valley are also being transferred to various provinces of India with the same moto in view. The

Muslims thus transferred were not to come back without official permission. The new plan was undoubtedly a calculated Indian scheme to weaken the liberation struggle, launched by the Muslims by removing their leadership. Another reason for their removal was that these educated Muslims were perpetually objecting to Indian brutal atrocities.

Against this treacherous move, there is a widespread resentment among the Muslim officials. Many officials are refusing to go out of the Valley fearing that they might face the fate of Kashmiri Muslim officials who were taken to Simla in 1947 on the same pretext and then butchered by Hindu *goondas*.

The Indian Army was also learnt of having giving training to 50,000 Hindu *goondas* in arson techniques.

In November 1965, the *Mujahideen* of Kashmir held violent demonstrations in Srinagar, Baramulla and Jajan in Held-Kashmir to press their demand of plebiscite. The police of India lathi-charged and tear-gassed the demonstrators. The demonstrators numbering several thousands carrying playcards paraded the main streets of the towns and raised different slogans : " We want plebiscite", and "The Indian savages, quit Kashmir".

The *Mujahid* demonstrators in the town of Jajan stoned the Indian police heavily resulting in injuring one officer. The police after the use of tear-gass and lathi-charge dispersed them and arrested all the leaders of the Plebiscite Front in the area. The police forcibly entered many houses for loot and completely destroyed three of them..

The Indian authorities had also victimised a number of Muslim officials. Many Muslim employees in the education department and in the police force were being forced to retire, while others had been transferred to outer places.

Sada-i-Kashmir disclosed that the Jan Sanghi *goondas* were being gathered and admitted to the educational institutions as students so as to create disunity among the students. With the help of the Indian police, these *goondas* have been looting Muslim shops.

The *Sada-i-Kashmir* announced that the Revolutionary Council of Held-Kashmir had called upon the people to continue their agitation for the persuing of their demand of self-determination under the banner of the Zonal Plebiscite Committee.

The Revolutionary Council appealed to the Muslims of Kashmir to maintain complete unity among themselves. The Council and the Kashmiri Muslims also reiterated their stand to achieve the goal of freedom.

All along, for 18 long years 1947—1965, India has been violating covenants and treaties made with the Kashmiri Muslims for determining the future of the State of Jammu and Kashmir through self-determination. The Kashmiri Muslims have been pressing their demand all along.

The covenants, treaties and agreements have got the greatest value in the international field. It is the pivot on which the whole structure of international relations hinges. But India attaches no importance to it and ceaselessly goes on breaking them. Even the British Empire, which was once the greatest power of the world and in whose empire, the sun was not setting, had to stick to the covenants and treaties and agreements made with the proples and the states. Abandoning of India, some other parts of Asia, the Middl-East, some parts of Africa, etc., by Great Britain, were all examples of fulfilling the covenants she had entered into with other peoples.

Islam attaches the greatest importance to international covenants and treaties. The Quran commands the mankind to fulfill covenants and promises.

Allah curses nations on account of breach of their treaties and agreements as He says in the Quran in 14:5 thus: " But We cursed them because of their breach of treaties (covenants) and made their hearts grow hard". The Quran, again, in 9 : 12—15 says :

" If the Kafirs (unbelievers) violate their treaties and taunt you in your religion, so you must wage a war against the leaders of *kufr*, because they do not stick to the treaties, they have entered into, in order that they may be checked and restrained. Will you not take arms against such people who violated their treaties.........and they had taken the lead in abrogating treaty with you. Do you fear such people ? If you are *Momins* (Muslims), then it is far more justly that you must fear Allah. So fight the people who are faithless to their treaties, and Allah will punish them by your hands, and will, thus humiliate them ; and He will assist you to overcome them, so that in this way He may heal the breasts of the Muslims, and may thus pacify their anger."

Again the Quran in 8:56—58 says :

" Those people with whom you have entered into a treaty or agreement, then they violate the treaty repeatedly and they do not fear. So if you overthrow them in war, impart them such a severe punishment, so that the ranks following them may flee by witnessing the doomsday of their rear ranks ; and so that this punishment may serve as a warning to them And if you fear treachery from any nation, throw back their treaty to them, so as to be on equal terms with them, because Allah, indeed, does not like the treacherous people".

The uprooted Muslim Kashmiris started *Jihad* for their existence and for attaining their legal right of self-determination as confirmed by the United Nations. Islam also supports their spirit of *Jihad*. The Quran in 2:190-191 says : " Fight in the cause of Allah those who fight you, but do not transgress limits, because Allah does not like transgressors, and slay them wherever you catch them, and turn them out from where they have turn you out, because tumult and oppression are worse than slaughter".

The downtroddon, uprooted and oppressed Kashmiri Muslims fed up with broken promises of the American-

controlled United Nations and an American-backed India, at last, stood on their own feet and organised themselves to gain their long-cherished target of freedom with a firm resolve to offer the greatest sacrifice that they could make.

They rose against the tyrant Indian occupation forces, regardless of all odds, and stepped forward fearlessly. With their strong faith in Allah and the cause of their righteousness, they did not hesitate to rise against the powerful enemy which was armed to the teeth and had a 50 crore strong nation at its back.

The world stood wonder struck at this unbalanced conflict between the oppressed Muslim Kashmiris, and the big Indian Union as oppressor. The world witnessed that the fearless *Mujahids* shocked the power-drunk Indians and thus turned a new page in their struggle of liberty.

On August 9, 1965, " *Sada-i-Kashmir* " radio announced the setting up of Revolutionary Council in Held-Kashmir.

On August 10, "the Revolutionary Council" established National Government, *Mujahideen-i-Islam* of Held-Kashmir cut roads, blast bridges, seized arms, food depots. There were heavy Indian casualties, Fierced fighting occurred between the oppressed and the oppressor. India rushed more troops to the held area.

Pakistan categorically denied Indian allegation, blaming Pakistan for the happenings in Kashmir.

On August 11, a fierce battle too was fought at Chhattabal, Baramulla, Mirakadal and Batwara. Batwara is situated in the neighbourhood of the airport of Srinagar, an important point of India's supply line in the Held-Kashmir.

The Muslims of Kashmir attacked an Indian Brigade Head quarters, killing 40 Indian Army soldiers and wounding 30 near Baramulla, a battalion of the Indian Army was completely smashed.

The *Mujahideen-i-Islam* of Kashmir inflicted heavy casualties on the 3 Indian Brigade Headquarters and had cut off another 12 roads in Occupied Kashmir.

Indian Atrocities. The oppressed Kashmiris continued their sustained efforts for achieving their right of self-determination throughout their war of liberation against India. The Indian authorities on their part, horribly intensified their efforts to quell this popular demand. The Muslims of Kashmir were subjected to extermination, torture and eviction. The Indian occupation forces, together with the support of Seva Sanghis, started a regular campaign of arson, loot and slaughter against the Muslim freedom-fighters. In the history of suppression, the atrocities of the Indian Army stand unparallel.

On August 24, 1965, the popular uprising in the India-held Kashmir made India very nervous. She threatened the genocide and exodus of the Muslims by force.

There was a public threatening from the Deputy Commissioner of Poonch, that the villages of Loran and Mandi would be set on fire as the people there were supporting the Muslims. Exercising these powers two villages were ablazed in which 50 Muslims were burnt alive.

It is more pitiable that the Indian Army, as usual, accused the Muslims for these actions of barbarism and arson.

The Defence Minister of India on September 16, 1965 before leaving for the capital of Kashmir for studying the situation in person, made a series of secret meetings with the famous Hindu Communalists and Jan Sangh leaders. He had imparted them instructions that it was their duty to support the Indian Army by way of terrorising the Muslim population so as to debar them from linking them with the *Mujahids*.

The first instance of the massacre plot was announced by the Srinagar Radio which said "the only outcome of

the present revolt would be a massacre of Muslims". After the warning there was a distribution of arms among the non-Muslims population of the State on a large scale. This resulted in a large-scale massacre of the Muslims.

India had not hesitated to murder the 122 prisoners of war in cold blood on November 16, 1965 when they were being transferred to Udhampur and other jails. All the handcuffed *Mujahids* were massacred.

Several Kashmiri Muslims were taken to India on the pretext of providing them better jobs there. They had been butchered by the Hindu *goondas*.

The Indians being defeated by Pakistan Armed Forces on former West Pakistan borders had gone amuck and embarked upon the wholesale genocide of the Muslims of Kashmir when the cease-fire was effected on September 23, 1965. They promptly encircled 38 villages of Poonch district and ordered the residents to come out of their houses. Those who resisted or hesitated were fired at. From the Haji Pir Pass, the Indians shelled more than 70 villages which came within their range.

Many villages were ablazed, others were evacuated and the remaining Muslim population including women and children were pushed into Azad Kashmir.

An eye-witness American correspondent in tears, said : "I wish President Johnson could come here to see what was happening to these people".

A girl of ten years old was picked up while her parents, brothers and sisters numbering 15 in all were either killed or imprisoned. A poor woman with a 2-year old child in her arms narrated that her husband was done away with before her very eyes, while she managed to escape to Azad Kashmir during the night. Another wailing woman narrated the sad plight of how the eyes of her husband and brother were taken out by the Indians. While still another described that her brother and father were skinned.

Indian soldiers murdered men, women and children without any discrimination.

On August 25, 1965, an eye-witness described account of the tragedy of Baramulla which was set on fire by the Indian Army on August 14. In this ablaze 436 houses and 3 mosques were effected. The tyrant Indians did not hesitate to burn several people alive and about 4 thousands rendered homeless. The burning of this village was pre-planned by the Indian Army. The fire booms were placed on the roofs of the houses and petrol was pumped by the Indian Army while residents were still inside. The typically cruel occupation forces did not allow them to escape the fire. Nobody from outside was allowed to save them as the area was completely sealed off. Some of the people who tried to rescue the victims were shot at and were forced into the fire to die.

Indians in order to save their skin alleged that *Mujahideen* had set the area on fire. But the foreign Press correspondents in Srinagar had acknowledged, that this barbacous act was that of the Indian Army.

The Indian Army had also ablazed several villages in Poonch and Rajauri sectors and fired on the Muslim population. The Muslims were leading a miserable life without food and shelter.

The Indians had let loose their tyrannies on the Muslims because they were *Mujahids*. This unjust pressure on the Muslims, of the Indian authorities had quite a different effect. The people began to co-operate more and more with the freedom-fighters.

Deputations of the refugees from Indian-Occupied Kashmir narrated harrowing tales of the tyrannies committed by the Indians troops on unarmed Muslims.

The instances of Indian atrocities which have been displaced are only samples. The Indians let loose their barbarous activities on a large scale which is difficult to account for here.

Revolutionary Council of Kashmir Proclamation. On August 10, 1965 the Revolutionary Council of Kashmir issued the following proclamation:

"Brave Kashmiris : Arise, for now is the time. We have suffered long enough under the oppressive and treacherous rule of impostors and enemy agents. Long enough have we allowed the trators to further the enemy designs.

"Remember that a Hindu despot who ruled over us, in utter disregard of the wishes of the people, sold us to India in 1947. This was the second sale of our land through a fraudulent and ignoble deed, which brought the might of the cursed Indian Army into our beautiful and peaceful land.

"Betrayed, though we were, we fought the enemy on every inch of our sacred soil. And we would have won, but for the intervention of the United Nations, who obtained an under taking from Indian that we will exercise our inalienable right of self-determination under a free and fair plebiscite.

" The United Nations was duped and so far the whole world. India dishonoured her international pledge shamelessly and with utter contempt for world opinion.

" She played for time to occupy our land. Since then, every day that has passed has been a day of misery and every night, a night of crime. You know what acts of cruelty, sacrilege and barbarity, the enemy has been perpetrating under the shadow of guns and bayonets.

" For years our great leaders, Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah and Mirza Afzal Beg, have been languishing in Indian prisons, but their determination to throw off the yoke of Indian imperialist remains unflagging.

" We have seen our children butchered, but every drop of their blood has illumined the path of our struggle.

"Our women were dishonoured, but in their agony they sanctified the course of our freedom.

" Our brave fighters lost their lives, but their dying-calls stirred the hearts of their compatriots. The will of our people remains imbroken, their united might unshaken. The enemy is on the run. We will not rest content till we have chased him out of our land."

" The time has come for us to deliver the final blow and hereby we take a solemn pledge to take up arms, once again and continue the fight till :

(a) The usurpers are expelled out of our land ;

(b) Our leaders now in jail are freed ; and

(c) The will of the people is allowed to determine the future of our land.

" The Revolutionary Council which consists of patriots of unimpeachable integrity and men of unswerving faith, has set up, today, the National Government of the people of Jammu and Kashmir which decrees as hereunder :

From today (a) All alleged treaties and arrangements between the imperialist Government of India and Kashmir stand annulled and are no longer binding on us. (b) The National Government of Jammu and Kashmir formed by the Revolutionary Council of Kashmir is the sole lawful authority in our land. (c) Only the National Government will be legally competent to receive taxes and dues from the people of the State. (d) Any Kashmir national who wilfully co-operates with the Indian Government or their puppet administration in Occupied Kashmir will be treated as a traitor and dealt with as such. (e) Every national of the State of Jammu and Kashmir who may be employed either by the imperialist Indian Government or its puppet administration, in civil or military capacity shall support the freedom movement of the Revolutionary *Council* in every possible way. (f) The National Government will issue orders and decrees on the Kashmir National Radio representing the "Voice of Kashmir" (Sada-e-Kashmir). (g) Any national of Kashmir, who impedes the freedom movement or disobeys any order or decree of the National Government, will be dealt with as a traitor.

" The Revolutionary Council appeals to the world to support this freedom movement.

" Now is the time for countries who have pledged themselves to help all freedom movements against imperialism to come to our assistance.

" We have nothing against the people of India but their governments have established a record of treachery and dishonesty in the world. We expect all sane and freedom-loving elements in India and particularly the brave Sikhs, the South Indians and the Rajputs, who have always given us moral support, to lend us active assistance.

" The people of Pakistan have stood by us in our fight. To our regret they have not done as much as we expected of them. Now is the time for them too to join us in our struggle for life and liberty.

" Let the nations of the world remember that if we go down, the light of freedom will be extinguished for ever.

" And, above all, you the people of Kashmir, you are the ones who are on trial. You are the ones who have to fight, for it is your own cause. You are the ones who might win this war for the sake of our coming generations, for the sake of freedom and for the sake of the glory of your motherland.

" Arise now, or there will be no tomorrow."

CHAPTER 6

SECOND JIHAD CAMPAIGN EVENTS

August 12, 1965. The main theatres of war between the Muslims of Occupied Kashmir and India were Baramulla, Srinagar, Uri, Poonch and Kargil. The Muslims set a petrol depot on fire in the vicinity of Srinagar. They also blew 6 bridges in the area.

The *Mujahideen-i-Islam* succeeded in crossing the river Jhelum at Balwara. Their main thrust had been towards the Radio Station, Airport and the Secretariat of Srinagar. They ambushed a military truck. They killed 3 soldiers and wounded 12.

Another group of the Muslim freedom-fighters destroyed a police post near Srinagar and killed 50 Indian soldiers.

Baramulla was completely cut off from Srinagar and a fierced fighting ranged there.

The *Mujahideen-i-Islam* also destroyed the entire Indian military camp at Jaurian near Jammu.

August 13. The Muslims set on fire petrol deposts, destroyed a camp of the Indian Army in the area near Samba, situated on Pathankot-Jammu road, and cut off telegraph and telephones there. They ambushed a big Indian Army convoy there. They also blew 50 trucks. 29 Indian soldiers were also killed, whereafter the Indian ran away in disorder.

The *Mujahideen* attacked the police lines in the outskirts of Magarwal Bogh, Srinagar and inflicted heavy casualties on them.

Again at Jaurian, there was a major clash between the Indian Army and the Muslims. In that encounter the Indians lost their 10 soldiers while 14 were seriously injured.

In the vicinity of Uri there was also an encounter between the ill-equipped *Mujahideen* of Islam and two well-equipped companies of the Indian Army which lasted for 6 hours. Afterwards, in the cover darkness, the Indians fled from the camp leaving their 30 dead and 10 wounded in the battle-field.

August 15. At Batamalu, only 3 miles from Srinagar, the freedom-fighters blasted many a government building and entrenched themselves in the heart of the city.

The Muslims of Held-Kashmir on the Independence Days of Pakistan and India continued to press in Nowshehra, Uri, Baramulla, Poonch and Jammu. They also continued their thrust towards Srinagar, the Capital of Held-Kashmir.

In an encounter with the Indian Army about 4 miles away from Srinagar, the freedom-fighters killed 139 soldiers, wounded 25, captured an officer and 3 soldiers.

Heavy fighting raged in Baramulla inflicting big losses on both sides.

Fierce conflict also broke out on the Kargil-Srinagar Road.

Srinagar was cut off from outside and two bridges on Srinagar-Badgam Road were set on fire by the Muslim *Mujahids*.

In a bid to create hatred against the *Mujahids*, the Indians troops began to set houses on fire.

The Indians made efforts to cross the cease-fire line, but in vain. They suffered heavy losses and withdrew in disorder.

In the Lalial area of the Bhimber Sector, the Indians had selled for three days in Azad Kashmir posts.

A strong protest was lodged with the United Nations observers for the cease-fire violation.

August 16. India used artillery and planes against the freedom-fighters. Indian Army violated cease-fire line and forcibly reoccupied three posts in Kargil.

Although India resorted to the use of heavy guns, morters and the Air Force for the safeguard of Srinagar, the Muslims attacked Srinagar from all sides, and set a number of government buildings on fire, destroyed supply depots, blasted petrol dumps and paralysed communications.

The conflict continued on all fronts including Kargil, Rajauri, Uri and Jammu. Everywhere the villagers and traders were anxious to support the *Mujahids*. In the Uri area the Indian Army was demoralised. The *Mujahideen* had established five posts there. The situation was out of the control of the Indian authorities. More than 135 Indian soldiers were put to death or wounded. 15 Indian soldiers were also killed in the ambush in the Srinagar area.

In the Poonch Sector, the Muslims compelled the Indian troops to withdraw and had set up 5 posts in that area. Indians suffered heavily. 55 Indian soldiers lost their lives in the encounter.

All-India Radio said that a fresh fighting between the Indian Army and guerillas had broken out, 18 miles south-west of Srinagar. The radio said that two civilians lost their lives in the conflict at Sardar and the guerillas were said to have suffered heavily.

August 17. Before mounting their attack, the Indians shelled Azad Kashmir positions for three days. They made advances towards Banchiran, New Gakhri and Purani Gakhri. The Azad Kashmir troops checked their advances, humiliated their efforts and forced them to retreat to their positions. In the encounter, the Azad Kashmir troops seized a heap of Indian weapons and equipment. The captured arms comprised American-made rifles, Sten-guns and light machine guns. Personal documents of Indian soldiers were also found.

Having humiliated at the hands of a small number of *Mujahids*, the Indian Army was in the state of harassment.

A dozen tanks, numerous planes and thousands of Indian troops stood guard of the main entrance of Srinagar. In and in the vicinity of Srinagar, the Muslims engaged the Indian Army at 8 positions. The Muslims succeeded in killing a brigadier.

The *Mujahideen-i-Islam* had succeeded in capturing 8 Indian posts in Srinagar and Poonch.

Pakistan lodged protest with the United Nations against the aggression and provocation of the Indian troops.

August 18. Indian forces blasted Muslim villages in Kashmir. The *Mujahideen-i-Islam* of Kashmir attacked Indian battalion at Baramulla and captured 25 officers of the Indian Army. They also seized 2 machine-guns, 4 sten-guns, 8 rifles and a huge quantity of ammunition.

The Muslims withstood the Indian troops at many places north-west of Srinagar. In the Poonch area they had attacked 4 Indian posts, and captured a vast area in that sector.

August 19. Pakistan asked the United Nations to execute Kashmir Resolutions.

In the Budhal area in Jammu, the freedom-fighters had seized an ammunition depot of the Indian Army. The Indians took to their heels leaving behind 4 dead and 7 wounded.

August 20. The *Mujahids* concentrated in the Jammu Sector and succeeded in cutting off the city from the rest of the State. They advanced within 6 miles of the city of Jammu. In two encounters 33 Indian soldiers were put to death. They also attacked an Indian Army convoy and set on fire 8 trucks carrying ammunition. They also captured 3 heavily-guarded Indian press south and south-east of Jammu. After fierced fighting, the Indians fled away, leaving behind 18 of their soldiers killed, several wounded and a huge quantity of ammunition. An Indian petrol depot south-east of Jammu was also set on fire.

In the Srinagar Sector, the revolutionary forces had set 3 bridges on fire after putting to death the guard-men of Indian forces.

August 21. In the war of liberation, the Muslims killed 113 Indian soldiers and wounded about 60.

They also destroyed 13 Indian military trucks and set 3 bridges on fire.

The Srinagar Radio acknowledged the engagement in a fierce conflict in Chhamb and Akhnoor between the freedom-fighters and the Indian forces. A deadly battle which took place 30 miles south of Srinagar, and in the Kargil and Uri Sectors were also announced by the Radio.

In the villages near Srinagar, a house-to-house searches for freedom-fighters were carried out. As a result, the roads were dotted with refugees fleeing from nearby villages. In the village of Khunmu, 9 miles away from Srinagar, shops and houses were shattered as Indian troops and police pressed their search of houses and shops.

August 22. At the Poonch Airport an aircraft of the Indian Air Force was destroyed by the *Mujahids* of Kashmir. They also destroyed a bridge near the Airport of Poonch, resulting in isolating it from abroad.

The Muslims also attacked the headquarters of a Brigade and a Battalion east of Poonch, and inflicted heavy casualties on the enemy.

In the encounter with an Indian convoy, the freedom-fighters destroyed two trucks, and injured an officer and 25 soldiers. They also captured a heap of arms and other supplies.

August 23. In the north of Baramulla the *Mujahideen-i-Islam* made a fierce attack on the Indian forces and killed 162 Indians.

The *Mujahids* ambushed an Indian military convoy. In this encounter 70 Indians were put to death. In the north of Rajauri, 12 more Indian soldiers were killed.

August 24. In the sectors of Uri, Rajauri, Poonch, Srinagar and Jammu there were fierce encounters between the Indians and the Muslims. The Muslims succeeded in killing 30 Indians and wounding 15. They also seized a heap of ammunition including hand-grenades.

The Muslims made a lighting attack on an Indian post in Uri and put to death 18 and wounded 6.

There were also fighting in Chhamb and Rajauri between the Muslims and the Indians. Heavy losses were inflicted on the Indians.

August 25. The freedom-fighter killed 195 Indian soldiers in fresh clashes in various areas of Occupied-Kashmir.

In the Rajauri area 120 Indians were killed in one clash alone, when the patriots attacked a very big convoy of the occupation forces. Another 45 Indian soldiers were also killed in a number of clashes by the freedom-fighters.

August 26. 43 Indians including an officer were wounded while 13 were arrested. The arrested included 2 JCO's.

India announced that the situation in Kashmir was "much more grave".

August 27. In Poonch and Mendhar Sectors 2 Indian battalions were smatched.

South-east of Mandi, the Muslims attacked an Indian post and killed 7 Indian troops including a JCO.

In Uri Sector, the *Mujahids* besieged an Indian Army Contingent, which was in search of the hide-outs. In the encounter 12 Indians were wounded and 15 were killed.

In the Mendhar, Poonch and Rajauri Sectors, the *Mujahideen-i-Islam* cut off telegraph and telephone lines.

India ruled out any mediation on Kashmir.

August 28. In the sectors of Kashmir and Jammu, the Muslim freedom-fighters gained more successes on all fronts. They inflicted heavy casualties on the Indians both in men and materials.

In the Uri Sector, the Kashmiri Muslims fought fierced battle with a full Indian battalion. The timid Indian troops used heavy artillery and pumped aimlessly at least five thousand shells in all directions. In this encounter only 2 *Mujahids* were killed and three wounded. The Muslims, in another clash, compelled the Indian to retreat.

Two companies of Indian troops in the Poonch area were attacked by the Muslims. This caused panic in the Indian troops and they fled away.

In the Tithwal Sector, the occupation forces tried to destroy suspected hide-outs of the Muslims who had been continuously attacking the enemy supply lines and ambushing convoys loaded with reinforcement, arms and ammunition.

India violated cease-fire line in Bedore. They suffered heavy losses.

August 29. The President of Azad Kashmir asked India to vacate occupied posts. Fierced fighting ensued between the Indians and the Muslims of Kashmir on various sectors of the Held-Kashmir. In these encounters 90 Indians including 3 officers were put to death, and 40 were wounded.

At Maidan, the *Mujahids* in a lightning attack ransacked an Indian post. They defeated them and put to death all those who could not run away. A large quantity of ammunition was also seized.

At Sommarg, near Srinagar, the Muslims of Kashmir attacked an Indian unit in which 60 Indians were put to death and 17 were wounded.

There was another clash east of Rajauri in which 20 Indian soldiers were wounded while 30 were put to death.

In Noshera, the *Mujahideen-i-Islam* conducted a lightning attack on the Indian mountain artillery and succeeded in inflicting big losses on them.

August 30. The Indians attacked the ill-equipped *Mujahideen* with the support of artillery and mortar on Pir

Sahaba. The *Mujahideen-i-Islam* with the help of Allah, were enabled to resist and repulse it. The enemy having large armies was humiliated as she suffered heavy casualties at the hands of the few *Mujahids.*

The enemy was also forced to retreat from Haji Pir Pass. Enemy had thrown in several battalions to push across the cease-fire line but all their efforts were frustrated.

In the north of Srinagar, the *Mujahideen* had also engaged an Indian position. Throughout the night, a pitched battle was fought. This resulted in losses on both sides.

Successive Indian attacks in Tithwal Sector were also repulsed.

August 31. As the freedom-fighters were inflicting continuously heavy losses on the Indian occupation forces, there was thus desperate anger and wrath in India against the Muslims of Jammu and Kashmir.

In the Uri Sector, at Rampur Army headquarters, an Indian Army brigadier was seriously injured while he was busy in reading a map of war. He later died in the hospital in Srinagar.

Again, only two miles from Srinagar, at Tapar, another Indian Lieut-Colonel was killed. In sheer retaliation the Indians resorted to the killing of several civilians.

Bridges were blasted by the Muslims, resulting in the suspension of traffic on Baramulla-Leh Road.

A state of martial law existed in Srinagar, where the Indian forces had established pickets at every road junction and roads leading outside the city. In a humiliating manner all outgoing and incoming persons were searched and they were often tortured. Women were compelled to lift their *burqas*, followed by repeated cases of molestation. Beards of Muslims and Sikhs were pulled on the pretext of verifying whether they were not fake.

Around the Muslim Suburbs trenches were dug in many places in Srinagar.

In a mad bitterness, the house of Mr. Ghulam Shah, who was Deputy Secretary of the Law Department at Batamalu, was set on fire. Many taxi drivers were arrested on the mere suspension that a *Mujahid* was seen moving about in a taxi. All buses were ordered to transport fresh reinforcement of the Indian Army and contingents of Rajasthan police and the armed police.

September 1, 1965. The President of Pakistan warned India that aggression would not go unchallenged.

Azad Kashmir forces assisted by Pakistan troops crossed the cease-fire line and Occupied Chhamb and Dewa in Bhimber Sector. India brought in I.A.F. Four Indian jets were shot down.

There was fighting between the Muslims of Kashmir and India at many places. The main pressure of the freedom-fighters was around Srinagar. They blasted 3 bridges around Srinagar.

The *Mujahids* by making a lightning attack on an Indian battalion in the vicinity of Sonamarg inflicted heavy losses on it. They captured a huge quantity of equipment and ammunition.

September 2. India suffered heavily on all fronts.

The fighting took place at a number of places between the *Mujahideen-i-Islam* and Indian forces resulting in killing 30 Indian soldiers.

In the Poonch Sector 17 Indians were put to death and 27 were seriously injured. The Indians vacated a post without taking arms when the freedom-fighters attacked them.

September 3. Fierced fighting broke out in Chhamb area.

The *Mujahids* made a surprise attack on an Indian post in north-west of Sonamarg and killed 11 enemy soldiers. The enemy fled away leaving behind three machine-guns and 5 rifles.

The *Mujahideen* killed and injured 27 in a lightning attack on an Indian post. India, however, acknowledged only 14 killed.

September 4. An Indian convoy was attacked in Rajauri and put to death 38 Indian soldiers. A large quantity of ammunition was seized.

The main thrust of the *Mujahids* was around Poonch and they engaged the Indian occupation forces at many places.

September 5. The Muslims of India Held-Kashmir had many encounters with the Indian Army resulting in killing about 58 soldiers and injuring several Indians.

Azad Kashmir forces captured Jaurian. India rejected United Nations call for cease-fire. Pakistan requested the United Nations to settle the basic issue of Kashmir through plebiscite.

September 6. In Occupied Kashmir, the *Mujahids* had intensified the struggle of liberation and blasted 2 famous bridges near Srinagar.

India had extended her aggression war on Pakistan. She launched a three-pronged surprise on Pakistan.

September 8. A big clash occurred between the *Mujahids* of Held-Kashmir and Indian occupation forces, in which the freedom-fighters after a night-long-fight defeated the Indians.

The freedom-fighters destroyed 15 vehicles in Srinagar-Sonamarg Road. They also ambushed another military convoy in Rajauri area and succeeded in setting on fire 13 Indian trucks.

September 9. The *Mujahideen-i-Islam* destroyed several bridges of stratigic importance in Rajauri area.

In another encounter with the Indians, the *Mujahids* killed 35 Indian soldiers, wounding another 15. They also seized a mortar gun and some other military equipment.

September 12. In the outskirts of Srinagar, the *Muslims* of India-Held Kashmir made 2 successful raids on the Indian Army positions. They also ambushed a convoy near Srinagar and caused heavy loss to several vehicles.

In another raid the *Mujahids* destroyed two bridges on the Srinagar-Kargil Road.

September 13. In various encounters all over Occupied Kashmir, the *Mujahids* put to death more than 30 Indian soldiers.

A surprise attack was made on an Indian military brigade stationed in Gulmerg, in which 60 Indian troops were killed. The freedom-fighters also made a attack on ammunition dump. The dump was on fire and an Indian military officer was captured.

September 14. The Kashmiri *Mujahideen* destroyed an entire military base at Pattan, nearly 15 miles away from Srinagar. The Indians were so much panic-striken that they started firing at each other. This fighting among themselves ranged throughout the night and the entire base was filled up with Indian corpses.

At another place, without firing a single shot, the *Mujahideen* made the Indian guards abandoned their charge and vanished, leaving a big quantity of reinforcement in the form of ammunition and supplies for the patriots.

September 15. The Kashmiri *Mujahideen* attacked police station at Badgam. All the armed police-men were put to death. A huge military camp in Rajauri state was destroyed by the *Mujahids*.

September 16. The Kashmir Muslims were in control of the Rajauri area. The civil administration was efficiently run there.

September 17. The Kashmiri Muslims of India-Held area took a new turn when they attacked the militia headquarters in Srinagar.

They also ambushed a big military convoy on Kargil Road. Most of the Indians of the convoy were killed and 5 vehicles were blown up.

September 18. The freedom-fighters routed an entire Indian battalion in Rajauri Sector. They captured a big heap of arms including 5 machine guns, 21 rifles, 50 sten-guns etc.

September 20. In two different clashes, the Kashmiri Muslims killed 73 Indian soldiers in Occupied-Kashmir. In the Riasi area, the *Mujahids* pierced through an Indian Reserve Police Post and killed 5 Indian Army engineers and 30 Indian policemen. After capturing a heap of arms, the *Mujahideen* set the post on fire.

The *Mujahids* also ambushed a big military convoy on the Srinagar Kargil Road. In that conflict 33 Indian soldiers were put to death. In this clash some very important documents also fell into the hands of the *Mujahids*.

September 21. The Muslims of Kashmir attacked an Indian military force marching on foot towards Rajauri and killed 30 Indian soldiers. Despite the utmost attempts of the Indians, the Muslims continued to control the area of Rajauri, which they had subjugated about 10 days back.

September 23. The Kashmiri Muslims of India-Held Kashmir blocked at many points, the road connecting Srinagar with Jammu resulting in suspension of the traffic.

The Muslims of Kashmir made two separate raids on Indian military convoys near Srinagar and caused heavy losses to the enemy.

Cease-fire between India and Pakistan became effective at 3.00 A. M.

September 25. About two hundred soldiers of the Indian occupation army were killed by the Muslims. The *Mujahideen* again cut off Srinagar from Jammu and destroyed a bridge near the Banihal Tunnel.

A lightning attack was also made at a bridge headquarters at Baramulla.

An Indian battalion convoy was also ambushed in the Rajauri area. More than 70 Indians were killed in this clash and all Indian trucks carrying ammunition were set on fire.

September 26. Many clashes took place between the *Mujahids* and the Indian occupation forces in which more than 200 Indian soldiers were done away with and several injured. Heavy damage was caused to the Indian military installations in the area. Many Indian heavy guns were also destroyed.

The *Mujahids* killed all the Indian troops guarding bridge and afterwards destroyed it.

September 28. The Kashmiri Muslims in a hand-to-hand battle with the Indians killed 18 Indian soldiers.

The *Mujahideen-i-Islam* of Kashmir also made a surprise attack on an infantry contingent of the occupation army patrolling the area, east of Rajauri. A hand-to-hand conflict started in which 18 Indians were butchered, while the remaining saved themselves by running away from the battle-field.

In another encounter, 10 miles away from Srinagar, the Kashmiri Muslims took notice of an officer and soldiers who had taken shelter behind a rock and killed them instantaneously. A large quantity of arms also fell into their hands.

September 30. In two clashes which ensued between the Muslims and the Indians in Rajauri sector, 4 Indian Army compus were blasted and 14 Indians were done away with.

The *Mujahideen-i-Islam* shot dead 7 Indian policemen when they waylaid a police convoy. The fleeing policemen left behind military vehicles which were set ablaze.

In another raid the *Mujahideen* also attacked a convoy which was for carrying rations for the forward positions of the Indians and ruined 2 convoy vehicles.

October 2. The Indians attempted to destroy a Muslim village in the vicinity of Srinagar but in vain.

Another heavy army contingent was forwarding towards a village which was destroyed by the *Mujahideen.*

October 15. India's puppet government's secretariat was ablazed by the *Mujahids.*

The activities of the guerillas had increased and the Indian government had not been able to control them.

The Indian armed forces were setting villages on fire in the valley on the plea that their inhabitants gave refuge to *Mujahideen-i-Islam.*

The opposition leaders in India were demanding plebiscite to decide the future of Kashmir.

November 5. There was no dearth of acts of gallanty and bravery from the *Mujahideen-i-Islam* of occupied Kashmir. An eye-witness account described that a Muslim woman had killed 9 Indian soldiers with her own hand in an encounter with the Indian Army. There could be no exaggeration in this account as it was related by an Indian Major to a foreigner.

The foreigner was much impressed by the valour demonstrated even by Muslim woman in their liberation war against a huge Indian power.

The foreigner narrated that he had heard several tales of heroism of the Kashmiri Muslims against the Indian occupation forces and he wondered if India could manage to maintain its hold over the territory for long.

November 29. In a village in Rajauri area, while defending themselves with *lathies*, spears and hatchets, the Muslims of Kashmir killed 100 Jansanghis.

A big mob of Jansanghi *goondas* made an attack on a village Dongriwala at the close of the day. The villagers were quite ready to meet the challenge. A serious encounter ensued in which 50 Jansanghis laid down their lives, while the remaining took to their heels.

Kashmiri Leaders on Liberation Front. The Muslim political leaders in Jammu and Kashmir also did not lag behind in their efforts for the liberation of their motherland which has remained in the tyrant hands of the Hindus for so many weary years. The leadership has been very alert and vigilent for all the years. This leadership assumed, still a vigorous role after the formation of the Revolutionary Council in Kashmir. It induced the oppressed Kashmiri Muslims to take arms against their oppressors. This blood-bath demonstration brought to the notice of the world at large, the unflinching will of the Muslims of Jammu and Kashmir, to achieve the goal of their self-determination through plebiscite as acknowledged by the resolutions of the United Nations of 1947 and 1948. This struggle for independence on the part of the Kashmiri Muslims will go a long way in the annals of struggle for liberation. With such an unflinching and selfless leadership the Muslims of Kashmir could no longer remain slaves of the Hindu *Bannias*, who have been taking patronage under the Muslim rule for the last so many centuries.

The President of Azad Kashmir on August 15, 1965, said : " This critical hour when thousands of our brethern were locked in a life-and-death struggle in Occupied Kashmir, the people of this side of the cease-fire-line are bound to come to their rescue. Obviously, we cannot leave them at the mercy of a brutal force.

The President praised the heroic fight of the revolutionary forces in the Indian Occupied Kashmir and added : " The entire Kashmiri people are at their back and the day is not far off, when, by Allah's grace, the Indian aggressors will take to their heels.

He strongly condemned the Indian allegation describing the uprising in Occupied Kashmir as a "Pakistani conspiracy". He said that India could no longer believe the world opinion by blaming others for India's own misdeeds. The revolt in the held Valley was a logical result of the continuous opression and persecution of the freedom-fighters at the hands of the Indians. India's

mischief plan of annexing Kashmir had put a challenge to the Muslims of the India-held Kashmir which they had accepted bravely. India had further deteriorated the condition by persecuting and detaining the popular Kashmiri leaders, "the lion of Kashmir" Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah the founder and President of the Kashmir Plebiscite Front and Mirza Afzal Beg and others, besides exerting its agressive pressure along the cease-fire-line.

The President further declared that the Kashmiris were determined to gain their cherished target of linking their fate with Pakistan.

The Azad Kashmir President on November 5, 1965 severely objected to the behaviour of some world powers in side tracking the implementation of the second part of the United Nations' Resolution of September 20, 1965 relating to the satisfactory solution of the partition disputes between Pakistan and India with special reference to Kashmir. He feared that the second part of the Resolution was going to meet the fate of the two earlier resolutions passed by the Security Council long ago just after the Partition in *1947 and 1948*. The President also added that Russia was also not in the inclination of exerting her full weight both on India and America for an earlier solution of the Kashmir tangle. He pressed the Security Council members for the immediate implementation of the resolution as a whole and said that mere cease-fire would become meaningless. He described "I honestly feel that if both America and Russia made a serious effort, the future of Kashmir can be quickly decided. From the attitude of the permanent members of the Security Council, the President gathered that while the United States was not exercising her pressure on India for the solution of the political disputes with India, Russia had little concern to bother about. The President made an appeal to the United Nations to send a fact-finding mission or the Secretary-General himself come to Azad Kashmir to see how the Indian Army and other Indian *goondas* were carrying on massacre of innocent Muslims of Kashmir, burning them alive, and pushing them from the India-held territory to Azad Kashmir.

Criticising the United Nations, the Azad Kashmir President said that it had always danced to the tunes of powerful nations".

The veteran Kashmir, Ch. Ghulam Abbas Khan declared on August 19, 1965 that the people of Kashmir were not bound by the cease-fire Agreement and no principle, rule or international law could debar them from crossing it to go to the support of their Muslim brethern engaged in a life-and-death conflict against India's colonial occupation armies.

The Chaudhry said in a message: "The revolution that has broken out all over the Indian-held territory is a remark in the history of our freedom struggle. During this long time our freedom movement took different turns, but the basic object remained the same". He said that the history of our last 30 years is filled up with instances of determination to wrest our freedom from the tyrant Hindu ruler and from the Indian agressors.

He added: "Flood-gates of brutal suppression has been opened in Occupied Kashmir in the name of so-called secularism and democracy. Innocent people are being subjected to methods of torture unknown even in dark ages. In the circumstances there was no alternative for them but to rise in revolt disregarding all consequences". He added: "The world is not unaware of the Kashmiri people. They have sacrificed thousands of their men to secure their basic rights. They knocked at the door of the United Nations but that world body has remained indifferent to their just cause and their sufferings. Now as a last resort, they have taken up arms. The people of Occupied Kashmir are doing their duty and we cannot leave them to the mercy of the Indian aggressors. The people of Kashmir are not a party to the Cease-Fire Agreement. We have never recognised this artificial barrier that separates us from our brethern. No international law or rules can debar us from crossing the cease-fire-line to join our commerades-in-arms".

Ex-President of Azad Kashmir, Sardar Muhammad Ibrahim Khan said on August 19, 1965, that peace in Asia could only be protected if the United Nations implemented its own resolution of 1949 for upholding the right of self-determination for the Kashmiris.

He felt grateful for the support intended to the oppressed Muslims of Kashmir by Indonesia, Iran, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, China and other countries. He said that these countries had supported the right of self-determination for the Kashmiris.

He said that the Indians had attempted to undermine the liberation struggle of the people of Kashmir by calling it the handiwork of infiltrators. But all in vain. The Kashmiri people had themselves took up arms again the Indians.

In an appeal to the Afro-Asian countries, the Ex-President urged them to press upon India to agree to the right of self-determination to the Kashmiris for the sake of peace in the area.

The Muslim Conference Leader said on September 1, 1965 that by violating the cease-fire-line, the Indian Army has aggravated the already tense atmosphere. He was sure that the power-drunk Indian forces would soon collapse in their conflict in Kashmir.

He added that *Jehad* is a religious duty of the Muslims and the support of Allah is always with those who fight in Allah's way. The Muslims of Kashmir has taken up arms against Indian *Kafirs*, with the confidence that they were fulfilling religious duty and Allah would extend them *nusrat* (help). He praised the *Jehad* spirit of the *Mujahids* in the India-Occupied Kashmir and said that they had revived the old Islamic traditions.

The representative of the Kashmir Revolutionary Council in Pakistan told the United Nations Secretary General on September 10, 1965, that the only cause of the conflict was Kashmir, where she was committed to hold an impartial plebiscite.

He pointed out to the United Nations Secretary General that Sheikh Abdullah's warning that Kashmir was a powder keg for world peace " had undoubtedly proved true.

Mr. Tariq Abdullah, Sheikh Abdullah's son speaking as a member of the Pakistan delegation to the General Assembly at New York on October 1, 1965 said that in case the United Nations is unable to assess the "human reality" of the Kashmir situation, it must send an impartial commission to obtain the evidence of the acknowledged leaders of the people of Kashmir and to report its findings to the Security Council or the General Assembly.

He told the delegates that it was not an easy task for him to convey the sense of anger which the Indian aggresssiveness have aroused "in the mind of a Kashmiri", particularly one, whose father, Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah has identified with the freedom struggle in Jammu and Kashmir for more than two genrations.

Tariq Abdullah, son of the "Lion of Kashmir" brought to the notice of the delegations of the General Assembly, the various instances of the Indian atrocities on the Kashmiri Muslims in their war of liberation with India.

Tariq Abdullah also outlined for the delegates, the reality of the situation as it had been for the last so many weary years of Indian betrayals.

He also could not help taking up issue with an Indian statement that Kashmir was "an integral part of India, legally, morally and on the basis of the will of the people".

He took up the issue and belied it. He argued that it was well-known that the elections of 1957 and 1962 were all rigged.

He said: "For a man who had been a staunch nationalist all his life, a personal friend of Pandit Nehru, who condemned bigotry and fantatism, and under whose leadership Kashmir remained unattained with any religious

strife, it could not be but a wrench and a deep crisis to raise the banner of revolt against Indian occupation of Kashmir.

Much though he loved the principles of secularism, he could not tolerate that under that cloak, India should throttle the aspirations of the people of Kashmir, separate them from their brethren in Pakistan and hold them in bondage.

"He warned Mr. Nehru from 1952 onwards that India was following a disastrous policy in Kashmir and that, if she did not stick to the promise of a fair and impartial plebiscite, he would forfeit all claims to the respect and sympathy of the people of Kashmir as well as the people of the world. When in 1953, he publically stated his view that the future of India, Pakistan and Kashmir could not be secure without an honourable settlement of the Kashmir dispute, he was deposed and put in jail. For a long time no legal proceedings were brought against him. Whon a case was filed, it dragged on for several years. Finally Sheikh Abdullah was acquitted in 1964, but his freedom was short-lived".

Mr. Tariq Abdullah, the Liberation Movement's London representative, told a Press Conference at the United Nations on October 14, 1965 that the Kashmiri *Mujahids* would continue their struggle against India, despite the Indo-Pakistan Cease-Fire Agreement.

He defended the right of the people of Kashmir to cross the cease-fire line from the Pakistan side to the Indian side as it was a matter of a single people in a single territory. He said that there was no possibility of a plebiscite in Kashmir. He said that at least 85 per cent of the population would vote to join Pakistan.

Tariq Abdullah, the son of "the Lion of Kashmir" told a Press Conference at New York on October 15, 1965 that Kashmir was not a Christmas cake that could be divided for India and Pakistan.

Refuting the possibility of an Independent Kashmir, he cleared that there was no demand on the part of Kashmiri Muslims for adopting to such a course. He made it crystal that international bindings among India, Pakistan and the United Nations channeled for a plebiscite to choose between the two countries of Pakistan and India.

Tariq Abdullah had also written many letters to some distinguished personalities such as late Earl Russel, Sir Dingle Foot, the editor of "The Guardian", "The Times" London etc., regarding the grave situation in Kashmir.

CHAPTER 7

WORLD PRESS SUPPORTED LIBERATION OF KASHMIR

The Muslim World. The Muslim world, open heartedly supported the Muslims stand on Kashmir. They generously offered their support at this critical time. The Hindu-India's aggressive war on the Muslims in a way infused awakening among all Muslim countries of the world. The spirit of Muslim fraternity was re-established and cemented. The Quran's call to the Muslims (*vide* Al-Quran 3:103) : "And hold fast altogather (O Muslims) by the rope of Allah and be not divided" was revived. It was a good omen in disguise.

Indonesian people demonstrated outside the Indian Embassy in Jakarta on September 3, 1965, against Indian policy in Kashmir. They shouted the slogan "of crush India" and waved banners which contained: "Let the Kashmiris exercise the right of self-determination" and "Free the lion of Kashmir, Sheikh Abdullah". A delegation of the demonstrators also entered the Embassy and presented a petition attacking Indian policy in Kashmir.

Thousands of Indonesian students and youths held a demonstration at Jakarta on September 9,1965 in which they supported the cause of the Muslim Kashmir and condemned India's armed aggression both against the people of Kashmir and Pakistan.

The Secretariat of the Afro-Asian journalist Association at Jakarta on September 9, 1965 attacked the Indian aggressive policy and said that it weakens the Afro-Asian solidarity and violates peace in Asia.

About 2 lakh volunteers from Central Java presented themselves symbolicably to crush Indian aggression in

Kashmir. Indonesian youth front pressed Indonesian to quit the United Nations and break off diplomatic relations with India, America and Britain.

The King of Jordan declared that his country will continue to support and stand by Pakistan in its struggle with India over Kashmir.

The Prime Minister of Jordan announced: "The problem of Kashmir which involves justice and right of self-determination awaits solution. It is a human problem and should be approached as such. We in Jordan and the Arabs as a whole feel about this problem the same way as our Pakistani brethren do. We also pray to Allah that He may grant victory to Pakistan in her struggle and the people of Kashmir may attain their freedom and independence. I say this because Allah has enjoined on us to be brothers. Verily all Muslims are brothers."

In a statement on October 5, 1965 from Damascus, Al Seyed Muhammad Al-Kattani paid glowing tributes to Pakistan people. He said: "You have done your duty to Islam and you have hauled the flag of Islam very high. It is high time that every Muslim in the world join you and help you in every respect.

"Pakistan today is facing the most critical problem and that is of Kashmir, the land of pure Muslims who were denied their right of self-determination by India. The Indian Government has committed most treacherous acts and atrocities in Kashmir contrary to the human right and United Nations Charter".

"It is high time now that the supporters of self-determination all over the world disregarding of any people and community give support to the people of Pakistan in her cause in Kashmir, not only morally but also materially by recruiting volunteers to join Pakistan in her struggle.

The Lehanese daily "Beirut-al-Massa", on October 2, 1965 commenting on the right of self-determination of Kashmir said, "You Indian Ambassador and Israeli gangs should realise that the people's right to self-determination

cannot lapse through passage of time. Usurpation by aggressors of other peoples territories is a crime which cannot be subject of the theory of passage of time. If the theory of the passage of time is to be applied to the right of people, then India itself would not have been enjoying sovereignty over its soil; India would have been still subject to the British Crown. Time passes but rights remain and *Insha-Allah*, Kashmir and Palestine shall return to their people".

Cairo's journalist, Syed Al-Aqad, writing on August 24, 1965, in his newspaper "Al-Misaa," said: "Kasmir is a powder keg in Asia. It has been continuously provisioning Indo-Pakistan relations and any further delay in a peaceful solution of this problem will lead to bloody consequences for the two countries".

The journalist pointed out that the Kashmiri people were linked to West Pakistan by religion, culture, economy, history, geography and even rail and road communications.

A Tehran Daily, "Ettel 'at" dated September 7, 1965, writing in its editorial under the caption "Another Tragedy in "Asia, said that "The conflagration of war was engulfing the whole of Indo-Pakistan sub-continent".

It added: "Pakistan, tied with historical, religious and cultural bonds with the people of Kashmir, can hardly afford to leave the Kashmir issue unsettled. This was particularly notable, said the paper in case of Pakistan when India tried to alter the political status of Occupied Kashmir recently and wanted to bring about the integration of Kashmir with India as a *fait acompli* and deny the very existence of a dispute over Kashmir. The solution of this dispute by India is, however, unilateral and incomplete disregard to the fundamental rights of the people of Kashmir. This was also contrary to all principles of democracy that are being preached and talked about so often by India".

A Turkish student described "The Turks were willing to fight against the Indian aggressors because self-determination was a natural right of humanity and the only way to solve the Kashmir problem".

China supports Plebiscite in Kashmir. During the Kashmir's war of liberation China also did not lag behind in extending her moral support to these oppressed people.

China's Foreign Minister on September 4, 1965 said : "We condemn Indian imperialism for violating the cease-fire line, promoting and enlarging the conflict in Kashmir. We support the just action taken by the Government of Pakistan to repel India's armed provocations.

"We reaffirm our constant stand that we consider that the Kashmir question must be solved in conformity with the commitment made by India and Pakistan and in accordance with the pledges made to the Kashmiri people and also in conformity with the wishes of the people of Kashmir.

The Chinese Foreign Minister also refuted the Indian propagandists allegation that the Chinese were training the *Mujahids*. He said that it was a habit of the Indian press to slander both China and Pakistan. He added that the Indian and Western Press have always been associating China with the Freedom movements all over the world. He said that such things are creditable for Chinese people.

"Communist Peoples Daily", an official organ, in its report published on September 4, 1965 from Peking accused India of her aggression in Kashmir. It stated that Pakistan's troops were compelled to push back in self-defence after Indian troops "powered across the cease-fire line and pushed deep into the Pakistan controlled area".

The "New China News Agency", in its issue of September 4, 1965 made a long statement on the Kashmir dispute. It traced the history of the broken pledges by Indian to the Kashmiri people since 1947, subjecting Kashmir to a reign of terror, throwing numerous of its public leaders and others into jails in an attempt to stamp out the local people's struggle for liberation. This naturally resulted in an armed uprising against the oppressor India.

The Agency further remarked: "Attention should be called to the fact that the United Nations remained tight-tipped all the time when India first broke through the

cease-fire line and pushed into the Pakistan-occupied sector in mid-August. But the moment Pakistan began to bit back, the United Nations Secretary General at once called on both sides to cease-fire".

"The People's Daily" in its issue of September 5, 1965 from Peking reviewed the Kashmir struggle for independence and remarked: "Anyone who follows the development of the situation there will see, that the armed uprising was an inevitable result of the reactionary Indian Government rule. So many weary years, the Indian Government has defied the Kashmir people's demand for self-determination and deprived them of their democratic rights. It has gone to all lengths in subjecting them to communal oppression and political persecution, made whole sale arrests, and held local public leaders in prolonged detention. It made life impossible for the local population through extortion, taxation and ruthless exploitation".

"It is, therefore, no surprise that, pressed beyond the limits of endurance, the people in the Indian-held sector of Kashmir should have risen in revolt. In fact, this popular struggle against the Indian tyranny is quite understandable in as much as there already have been numerous cases of hungry people ransacking rice stores, workers and students going on strikes and businessmen observing *hartals* in many states of India itself. The truth is that greater the oppression, the bigger the revolt. The Indian Goverment's distressing predicament is entirely of its own making, and it can blame no one but itself.

As is well-known, the question of the status of Kashmir is an outstanding question left over from history. For the past so many years, India has sought to grab this disputed territory as its own. Both India and Pakistan had in the past agreed to settle the question peacefully through plebiscite. However, the Indian Government has since 1953 unilaterally violated its commitment by publicly declaring that Kashmir is an integral part of India".

"While barbarously cracking down on the Kashmir people recently, India at the same time infringed the cease-fire line agreed upon between the two countries, sent its troops into the area controlled by Pakistan and launched armed provocations against that country. Under such circumstances, it is perfectly justified for Pakistan to strike in self-defence."

"The Chinese people deeply sympathise with the just struggle of the people of Kashmir for their right to self-determination".

A Chinese student remarked: "We Chinese peoples stand with you against the Indian invasion over Kashmir and Pakistan".

An Iranian student said: "As Muslims, with one faith, one history and one future, we shall fight the tyranny". He added during the war "I joined the civil defence and patrolled the city".

An Indonesian student said: "The threat to withdraw from this organisation, to my mind, is a nail in its coffin; and the ousted President Soekarno of Indonesia, who is beloved by the people, hited the first nail. This world body should understand that Muslims cannot be easy victims".

A Zanzibar student said "I strongly believe that the fight for the right of self-determination must be fought as hard as for saving Africa from slavery.

The Britons and the Indo-Pak War. The Britons were rulers of the "British India" for about a century. Though after partion they have to leave India in 1947, yet they did not break off completely, as Pakistan and Bharat became members of the British Commonwealth. The long unsettled Kashmir dispute has also got connection with the Britons. During the Kashmir's war of liberation, naturally the English politicians, scholars, observers and pressmen could not remain all aloof. The reaction cropped up without reservation. Though on political grounds, Britain did not displease India, yet a majority of her people condemned India's naked oppression on the Kashmiris.

The late Lord Bertrand Russel. The late British Philosopher and Director of the world Peace Foundation reviewing the Kashmir war position on October 29, 1965 stated :

"In Kashmir, India has refused to allow a plebiscite for many years, despite the United Nations resolutions. One lakh Indian troops have suppressed Kashmir automany. Despite all this, all the time Mr. Nehru held back from invoking the two Articles of the Indian Constitution which would integrate Kashmir by decree. We must ask why the late Mr. Shastri invoked these two Articles, arrested Haji Sheikh Abdullah and thereby effectively closed the door to peaceful redress of the grievances of the Kashmiris. The answer to these questions suggests the cause of the out break of this war".

The British paper, the "Sunday Times" in its issue of September 10, 1965 said: India has obstinately rejected successive United Nations proposals for a plebiscite. Kashmir has brought the two greatest nations of southern Asia to the verge of an all-out-war which could plague them both for a generation, cause misery to millions of their people. The wretched people of Kashmir themselves, have never yet had the chance to decide their own future. The danger in Kashmir is fierce, but opportunity is correspondingly great because it is from danger that opportunity springs. Pakistan and India would never live in friendship until the canker of Kashmir is excised."

A British military observer writing from London on September 12, 1965 in "Weekly Review" pointed out that: "In Pakistan, war is mainly taken as a holy war for the liberation of the fellow Muslims, while in India the Kashmir issue has never gained popular support, even amongst the congressmen and Brahmins, the only supports of the late Nehru's policy on Kashmir. It was late Nehru's own personal whom, take warmly backed by yesmen for the fear of the great leader. Among the rural masses of India, particularly non-Hindu communities, there is little interest in the future of Kashmir.

"The principal manpower disadvertage of the Indian army lies in its high proportion of the southerners, unused to Himalayan conditions, as compared with the proportion of the mountainers available to Pakistan. The Indian Army consists of the Sikhs, but that community is not happy under the predominantly Hindu rule and which also does not accept their demand of a Sikh State in the East Punjab. On the other hand, Pakistan recruits the Punjabis, Baluchis, Pathans and others, all outstanding for fighting qualities, especially in the mountains of Kashmir. As an adjunct to the regular army, lashkars of Pathan tribesmen have already figured in the fighting in Kashmir and no doubt will do so again".

Reports in the Western Press such as: "The Daily Telegraph", "Time and Tide" and "Evening Standard" all indicated: "The Government of Pakistan is quite right to insist that the Cease-fire should be combined with a political solution of the Kashmir question. It is essential that the end of the fighting should result in a permanent solution and not in a festering sore anymore".

"Herald Tribune" of London in its issue of September 21, 1965 wrote: "The Indians feel that failure to hold Kashmir would threaten, the precarious unity of India".

"If the predominantly Muslim Kashmiris can vote themselves out of the Indian Republic, so may some of the other discontented nations and tribes, which differ from the prevailing Hindus, in religion, language and interest". For the Pakistanis, India's taking over of Kashmir is regarded as evidenced that India intends eventually to end the partition and to reunite the sub-continent establishing Hindu rule throughout".

"The Time" of London in its paper of September 21, 1965 wrote: "It is imperative that the Security Council grasp the importance of self-determination for Kashmir. This would demonstrate the United Nation's will to exercise its moral authority backed by an overwhelming world opinion".

United States Reaction. It is of great significance to note the United States' reacticn to the Kashmir war of liberation. "*Herald Tribune*" of New York in its issue of August 16, 1965 wrote that Pakistan and India should settle the Kashmir tangle because the perils are far too grave and the benefits far too small."

"Pakistan has a good case and claim to Kashmir, perhaps better than India. But there are already enough fires in Asia, and the major conflict might well destroy any remaining possibility of containing and limiting all the others in the area. Furthermore, a war between Pakistan and India would find the United States and most of the free world caught in the middle.

"The Philadelphia Inquirer" on August 24, 1965 in an editorial, had maintained that Pakistan deserves sympathise on Kashmir and wished that India be reasonable about this dispute.

The paper further observed : "The Kashmir dispute has dragged on year after dreary year, and it is hard not to sympathise with Pakistan in patience, because a United Nations' supervised plebiscite was supposed to have settled the future of Kashmir long before this. Muslim Pakistan is probably correct in assuring that if Muslim Kashmir ever gets to fills, union with Pakistan will follow, which of course, is one reason India evidently has been stalling".

Mr. Lewis. Commenting on the Indo-Pakistan war resulting from the Kashmir dispute, Mr. Fulton Lewis, a famous American broad-caster objected to the attitude of the United States towards India who was doublecrossing the United States and the rest of the free world day by day, an issue after issue in thc United Nations.

Mr. Lewis added "It is also the result of such supine State Department policies as our performances when India moved in with military force and seized the little Partuguese enclave of Goa, which had been legitimately Portuguese for centuries. The State Department did not even make a protest or a remonstrance, let alone mention the matter in the United Nations.

"As early as 1947, the late Premier Nehru specifically promised the people of Kashmir and of Pakistan that the Kashmiris could hold a plebiscite and could have self-determination for themselves. The fact is that the people of Kashmir are more than 80% Muslims, and have always been aligned with Pakistan which is Muslim, and have never wanted any part of India, which of course is Hindu, and abysmally backward.

"You have heard the factual record of the past fate of beautiful Kashmir and of India's outright dishonesty in dealing with it. The present war is no matter of momentary displeasure or disagreement, it goes back all these long years of infamy and duplicity on the part of the Indian Government.

"Mr. Nehru was worried much about aggression when it took Goa, but late Shastri has plenty to worry about now, because he is facing penal and disciplinary action by one of the toughest and best trained armies in the world, excellently equipped, excellently led, highly organised and totally dedicated. For himself, he (late Shastri) has a motley, disorganised, low morale force of four times as that of as Pakistan, but they cannot or won't fight. The only big military intelligence circles tend to place considerably more credence in the statements of the Pakistanis than in those of the Indians in the basis of the general past experience.

Mr. Fulton Lewis Jr. cleared the position of Kashmir in a number of his broadcasts. Millions of people listened him during the September 1965 war. He said : "This is not a difficult question to resolve. The facts are all on the record, and the equities in the matter are as clear as crystal. The fundamental key-note in the United Nations Charter is that all people have a right to determine their own form of government and their own destiny, and that, really, is the only reason for the existence of the United Nations".

"The history of the so many years old dispute, is a history of continuous and persistent Indian perfidy and infamy in the dealings of Kashmir, and one in which it is

impossible to read the balance-sheet of right and wrong in anything but one set of figures. The Indians have made repeated promises and guarantees, only to break them on repeated occasions.

"They have lied about incontrovertible facts. They have practised the same routine of double dealing and double-talk that they have used to make fools and laughing stocks of our (Americans) ambassadors to their country (India) and of our State Department in Washington".

He further said: "Kashmir is 80 per cent Muslim, and if the people were granted the right to exercise their own self-determination and decide for themselves whether they want to be part of India or part of Pakistan, they would vote at least by that percentage margin to join Pakistan. But India, occupying the country by force, has refused to permit any such plebiscite because they know it would go against them, and Pakistan's present action is simply a challenge to power to continue to occupy Kashmir by military force any longer, and an ultimatum that there is going to be a plebiscite, whether India wants it or not".

The Indian Press. It is also interesting to read the Indian Press in the Muslim's Kashmir war. During the war, no doubt, the Indian press openly and freely violated the fundamentals of international press but there were a few exceptions too. The main aim of this deviation was to fix the Indian masses against Kashmir and Pakistan. However, there existed, a section of Indian press, though a very small, which remained aloof from setting afloat rumours, lies and exaggeration.

Master Tara Singh. The late Veteran Indian Sikh leader, Master Tara Singh, in an article published in "Parbhat" on October 7, 1965 wrote: "If no other proposal can be agreed upon to ascertain the wishes of the people of Kashmir, the only just and democratic method of doing it is a plebiscite, which is recognised the world over. This is what Pakistan demands. But to counter this, it is said that Pakistan has no right to interfere in this matter. True,

but the Kashmiris have the right to decide their fate as they like, and their opinion should be ascertained through an impartial plebiscite conducted under an impartial auspices.

"When Pakistan demands a plebiscite in Kashmir, then India opposes it, one is bound to conclude that Pakistan is confident of winning it, while India is not. The Indians say why should there be a plebiscite when the issues have been settled finally. The answer to this is simple. If the Indians are sure that the people of Kashmir are with them, they should agree to a plebiscite to avoid war, blood-shed and destruction. Why should not the danger of war be thus averted? If it breaks out again, it may engulf the whole world, why should then any reasonable proposal to prevent it be spurned?

"The Indian assertion that the issue has been finally resolved is quite meaningless. There is a cease-fire line which is supervised by neutral observers. Moreover, India herself insists that Pakistan should vacate the area under her control. This shows that India too does not consider the present position of the State to be correct."

The late Indian Sikh leader made it clear that as a party to a dispute, India cannot become its own judge. Being just a party, she cannot deliver the judgment.

The late Indian Sikh leader had further said : "It is no longer possible to hold down a people by force. With the present development means of communication, oppression anywhere gets known. No oppressor can hide it for long through lies. That is why I say that neither India nor Pakistan can keep their hold over Kashmir against the wishes of the Kashmiris".

World Press Supports Plebiscite in Kashmir. The right of self-determination for the people of Jummu and Kashmir was acknowledged through the resolutions of the United Nations. Britain and India supported this right for all nations including the State of Kashmir through their official announcements.

The Atlantic Charter was prepared and completed under the supervision and patronage of the big three: United States, Soviet Russia and United Kingdom. This Charter extended strong support to the right of self-determination for small nations and independence for the oppressed ones. The credit for the freedom of so many Middle-East and Afro-Asian countries including Pakistan and India does go to the wise enforcement of this Charter.

This Atlantic Charter also guarantees the right of self-determination to the people of Jummu and Kashmir.

India again acknowledged the right of self-determination for the Kashmiris during the Kashmir war of liberation. It was, also one of the conditions of the cease-fire on September 23, 1965. At the Tashkand Declaration India too had accepted this demand.

But again, as it is usual for India, she backed out of her international commitments and wrongfully began to claim that Kashmir is her '*Atut Ang*'— "integral part". This comes as an utter surprise to the nations of the world. India could no longer mislead the world. The world press began to support a United Nations-supervised plebiscite in Kashmir.

"Pravda," a Soviet newspaper, in its issue of Aug. 24, 1965, observed: "There is no doubt that the conflict in Kashmir cannot benefit either of the sides directly involved in the dispute. Pakistan and India are engaged in the solution of intricate domestic problems, above all questions related to their economic development, and this requires tremendous funds and efforts by their peoples. The mass of the population of Pakistan are interested in peace and friendship with all countries, with each other.

" The conflict in Kashmir is being exploited by reactionary forces as a pretext for fanning Indo-Pakistan enmity. The conflict in Kashmir plays into the hands of the American imperialists who are waging an aggressive war in Vietnam.

"A settlement of the current situation in Kashmir is imperative. It will make a major contribution to the maintenance of peace in Asia".

It was reported from Peking on September 20, 1965, that the "Singapore Barisan", an organ of the Singapore Socialist Front, said in a commentary on September 11, 1965 that in the Indo-Pakistan conflict, India was the aggressor and Pakistan the victim.

The paper observed that the United Nations had never given any positive help to the Kashmir people to gain self-determination ever since it began to take up the Kashmir dispute.

The paper further remarked that India would never succeed in subjugating the Kashmir and Pakistan people by depending, on the military and economic support from some great Powers.

A weekly of Kathmandu, " Naya Samaj " in one of its issues praised Pakistan's patience and added : "The Indian accusations against Pakistan are purely motivated for concealing all the crimes committed by herself. Observers have said that the revolt launched by the people of Kashmir against India can be regarded a part of the people's consciousness growing in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The Kashmir revolt should not be described only as a revolt but it would be better to consider it as people's revolution; the sympathy of the nations which have received freedom recently goes naturally towards it." The weekly observed further "India seems apprehensive that if Kashmir gets her freedom through self-determination, then India's hold on Sikkim and Bhutan will be automatically lost". Observers, who are already conversant with India's ways since her border dispute with China say, that "it is always India which comes out first to declare that force will be met with force."

A popular United States magazine "Newsweek" on August 22, 1965, commenting on the Kashmir War of Liberation said : " After suffering a humiliating military setback in the Rann of Kutch, and belied by a severe food shortage and bitter quarrels among India's various language

groups, the Indian Prime Minister has to show his toughness with Pakistan". It added: "The Kashmiri Muslims have resisted Hindu rule for centuries and delight in slipping across the cease-fire-line to slit the throats of Indian Hindu soldiers. To Azad Kashmiris, Muzaffarabad is a temporary capital pending the day their Muslim brothers in the south-eastern 2/3rd of the land are liberated from Indian rule, and they can return to their traditional capital of Srinagar. Hastily scrawled street sings appear almost every night on the city walls of Srinagar: "Plebiscite is our demand." The Muslims literally resent the fact under the law of Hindu India that they are liable to seven years' imprisonment, if they are caught eating beef, a traditional Muslim food.

And geographically, as well as by religious inclination, their country naturally falls into Pakistan's orbit, for Kashmir's rivers flow towards Pakistan rather than towards India, whose access to the country is either by air or through a single-rugged mountain road.

"Those Kashmiris who take their grievances out into the states or quickly suppressed by club-weilding police and most of liberation movement leaders, including Kashmiris' national hero and former Prime Minister, Haji Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah, are languishing in jail without trial. But the disturbances go on and one Srinagar street has already earned the nick name of Rann of Kutch, because of the skirmishes that have taken place between town folk and police there".

Some other popular American magazines including "Time" and "Life" had offered some similar significant comments on the Kashmir war.

A lady from Japan said: "Keeping deep sympathies for Pakistanis, I hope that this Kashmir dispute will be solved through the right of self-determination under the international law".

A student girl from Phillipines added: "I can say Pakistanis are fighting for a principle", and have all the

confidence that Pakistan will win. She assured the gathering that the Phillipines was in favour of holding plebiscite in Kashmir.

The cause of self-determination of the people of Kashmir was upheld by the Nationalist Government of Nagaland.

A student of Palestine said that the right of self-determination was a birth right of human beings. This right of the Kashmiris was recognised by the United Nations in 1949 which could not exercise her own resolution.

Daily "el Djeich" in its editorial commented: "There is not the least doubt that the majority of the people of the population of Kashmir would be only too happy to get rid of the tutelage of New Delhi's Government. This is the opinion of almost of all observers of the world".

CHAPTER 8

KASHMIR CASE AND THE UNITED NATIONS

The Security Council has got credit for solving a number of international problems and tangles. She also succeeded in securing resolution for the right of self-determination for the Kashmiris. But unfortunately, it could not solve the tangle by implementation of plebiscite in the Valley. Perhaps, never before in its history, the Security Council has confronted with such a grave problem as that of Kashmir. The Security Council in its resolution of September 6, 1965 took up the issue, debated it, and pressed for some firm measures for its solution. Both countries of India and Pakistan were in adverse moods, the two ideologies were at war.

Pakistan, in the teeth of treacherous Indian attack, and possessing quite limited resources, stepped forward bravely to defend her homeland. She checked the stubborn enemy having so huge resources at the command. Inflicting stunning blows on India, Pakistan shattered India's dream of material supremacy. Already defeated and humiliated by China in her 1962 War, India seemed to have forgotten her long cherished dream of the leadership of Asia. The defeat of this huge country at the hands of quite a small nation, was not short of miracle for the world.

Finding the defeated India at the verge of its collapse, the Big Powers, through the United Nations came to her rescue. The United Nations now took it its duty to enforce cease-fire and made it effective sharply on September 23, 1965.

The Security Council was attempting to bring about cessation to hostilities. She had already made resolutions towards that end on September 4, 6, 20 and 27, 1965 .

On September 4, 1965 the Security Council had sent the following conditions for a return to normality along the cease-fire line (throughout the report, the initials of C.F.L. are used for this) :

1. A willingness of both parties to respect the agreement they have entered into.

2. A readiness on the part of Pakistan to take effective steps to prevent crossing of the C.F.L. from the Pakistan side by armed men, whether or not in uniform.

3. Evacuation by each party of positions of the other party now occupied, and withdrawal of all armed personnel of each party to its own side of the line, which would include the withdrawal once more of Indian troops from Pakistan positions in the Kargil area (the eastern extremity line).

4. A halt by both parties to the firing across the cease-fire-line that has been occurring from both sides in some sectors with artillery and smaller guns.

5. Allowing full freedom of movement and access to United Nations observers by both parties on both sides of the line".

Security Council's Resolution of September 6, 1965. The Security Council, noted the report by the Secretary-General on developments in the situation in Kashmir, since the adoption of the Security Council's Cease-fire Resolution on September 4, 1965. The same clauses were also contained in document dated September 6, 1965. The clauses of the document are :

1. Calls upon the parties to cease hostilities in the entire area of conflict immediately, and promptly withdraw all armed personnel back to the positions held by them before August 5, 1965.

2. Requests the Secretary-General to exert every possible effort to give effect to this resolution and the

resolution of September 4, 1965, to take all possible steps to strengthen the United Nations move and to keep the Council promptly and currently informed on the implementation of the resolutions and on the situation in the area.

3. Decides to keep this issue under urgent and continuous review so that the Council may determine what further steps may be necessary to secure peace and security in the area.

Security Council's Resolution of September 20, 1965. "The Security Council. having considered the reports of the Secretary-General on his consultation with the Governments of India and Pakistan.

"Commending the Secretary-General for his unrelenting efforts in furtherance of the objectives of the Security Council's resolution of September 4 and 6 of 1965 ;

"Having heard the statements of the representatives of India and Pakistan ;

Noting the differing replies by the parties to an appeal for a cease-fire as set out in the report of the Secretary-General (S/6683), but noting further with concern that no cease-fire has yet come into being ;

"Convinced that an early cessation of hostilities is essential as a first step towards a peaceful settlement of other related matters ;

1. Demands that cease-fire should take effect on September 23, 1965, and called upon both Governments to issue orders for a cease-fire at that moment and a subsequent withdrawal of all armed personnel back to the position held by them before August 5, 1965 ;

2. Calls on all states to refrain from any action which might aggravate the situation in the area ;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the necessary assistance to ensure supervision of the cease-fire and withdrawal of all armed personnel ;

4. Decides to consider as soon as operative paragraph 1 of the Council's Resolution 210 of September 6 has been implemented, what steps could be taken to assist towards a settlement of the political problem underlying the present conflict, and in the meantime calls on the two Governments to utilise all peaceful means, including those listed in article 33 of the Charter, to this end ; and

5. Requests the Secretary-General to exert every possible effort to give effect to this Resolution to seek a peaceful solution.

Resolution of September 27, 1965. The draft regretting the delay in the full achievement of a complete and effective cease-fire, and a prompt withdrawal of personnel to August 5 position called in the Security Council resolutions of September 4, 6, 20, and 27, 1965, numbering 209, 210, 211 and 214 :

1. Reaffirms its resolution of September 20, 1965, No. 211 in all its parts ;

2. Requests Pakistan and India to co-operate towards a full implementation of paragraph 1 of the resolution of September 20, 1965, calls upon them to instruct their armed personnel to co-operate with the United Nations and cease all military activity, and insists that there be an end to violations of the cease-fire ;

3. Demands the prompt and unconditional execution of the proposal already agreed to in principle by the Governments of Pakistan and India for a meeting of their representatives with suitable representations of the Secretary-General, appointed without delay after consultations with both parties, for the formation of an agreed plan and schedule for the withdrawals by both parties, and urges that such a meeting shall take place as soon as possible, and that such a plan contains a time-limit on its implementation, and requests the Secretary-General to report on the progress in this respect within three weeks of the adoption of this resolution ; and

(4) Requests the Secretary-General to submit for its consideration as soon as possible a report on compliance with this resolution.

Comments. The President of Pakistan, commenting on the cease-fire resolution of September 20 said : "World powers have given us firm assurance of their awareness of the gravity of the Kashmir dispute and of the urgency to resolution. If they fail in this, this Continent will again be engulfed in much wider conflict. The United Nations is on trial".

The President added that Pakistan had taken this decision in the interest of world peace, although the Security Council's Resolution of September 20, 1965 was both "inadequate and unsatisfactory". He decided that Pakistan had received firm assurances from World Powers of their awareness of the gravity of the Kashmir situation and the need of taking concrete steps to solve it.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan told a press conference at Islamabad on October 11, 1965 that the recent Resolution of the Security Council was a step forward towards the settlement of the Kashmir problem. He added that although the resolution was merely a reaffirmation of the earlier resolution of September 20, 1965 was satisfied with its adoption, as the Security Council had reiterated all the parts of the previous resolution despite India's bitter opposition.

Earlier on September 19, 1965, a Jordan's delegate on the Security Council had cautioned the Council to uphold the principle of self-determination in settling the Kashmir dispute.

He reminded the United Nations of its responsibilities, and he had remarked that United Nations responsibilities were far higher than merely seeking an end to hostilities on Indo-Pakistan war. He had cleared to the Security Council that there could not be any outcome of the cease-fire so long as the basic cause of solving the Kashmir problem was not forced. The cease-fire could only be effective if the people of Kashmir are restored the right of

their self-determination. He added that if the Council did not take concrete steps to solve the dispute, it would be prolonging the difficulties and perpetuating the dispute.

It was reported from New York on October 15, 1965 that the fresh call of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to Pakistan and India, for withdrawal of all armed personnel to the positions held before August 5, is being regarded in diplomate "circles" as "the first step towards a return of the Kashmir dispute back to the United Nations cold storage."

It was felt at New York that as the cease-fire had become effective, the Big Powers were no more in worry that there was any pressing need for the Security Council to do anything further.

Reports were said to be circulating at New York on October 15, 1965 that the insistence on withdrawal of all armed personnel which was said to be carried out at the behest of the two Big Powers, Russia and America, was a reflection of the demands of Big Power politics. It was said to be an open secret at New York, that both Russia and America were working together almost like allies and their only aim at the moment was to bring about a disengagement of Indian and Pakistani forces, so that they do not have to do any thing meaningful about the basic problem of Kashmir.

The Tashkent Declaration. The Soviet Prime Minister, in a message dated 4th September, 1965 addressed to the President of Pakistan, and the Prime Minister of India, expressed Soviet concern in a growing tension and larger military conflict. He stated that the agreement regarding the establishment of a cease-fire line in Kashmir, signed in 1949 had been violated. Both Pakistani and Indian regular military units had been involved in the military operations ; tank and aircraft were being used. The number of casualties was being increased from day to day. The military inflict in Kashmir, he stated, aroused

the concern of the Soviet Government and because it had occurred in an area directing adjacent to the borders of the Soviet Union.

Instead of going into the merits and demerits of the conflict, as well as into the causes and justification, the Soviet Premier, expressed a desire that the principal efforts should be concentrated upon the immediate cessation of military operation, the halting of the tanks and the silencing of the guns. The settlement of a dispute between two neighbouring countries, no doubt, was first and foremost matter for these countries and their Governments. " Nevertheless", he said, "the Soviet Government, guided by the interest of strengthening peace and international security and desirous of promoting the normalization of relations between Pakistan and India, would like to make some observations concerning the settlement of the conflict. In our opinion, the first step after the immediate cessation of hostilities could be the reciprocal withdrawal of troops to positions behind the cease-fire line established by the Agreement between Pakistan and India in July, 1949. Acting in the spirit of the United Nations' Charter and the Bandung Principles, the parties should enter into negotiations for the peaceful settlement of the differences that have arisen between them. As for the Soviet Union, both sides could count on its willing co-operation or, to use the accepted expression, in its good offices in this matter. We are ready for this, if both sides consider it useful."

On September 17, 1965, the Soviet Prime Minister, in another message addressed to the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India, deeply regretted that the armed clash between Pakistan and India continued, bloodshed had not been stopped and the conflict had not been ended. Though it was not possible to foresee all the negative consequences of the course of events, there were many reasons to fear, he stated, that a continuation of the conflict might cause irreparable harm to the national interests of both Pakistan and India, to the cause of peace and security of the peoples.

In developing its offer of good offices to both sides, the Soviet Government proposed for the consideration of the Governments of Pakistan and India to hold on Soviet territory, Tashkent or any other city in the Soviet Union, a meeting in which the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India would take part to establish a direct contact in order to achieve agreement on the re-establishment of peace between Pakistan and India. One thing was important to meet and start negotiations. It was further pointed out, as important that the guns became silent and the blood of the two fraternal peoples ceased to flow. Each new day of the armed conflict, it was pointed out, produced new complex problems, which above all imposed a heavy burden on the peoples of Pakistan and India.

The Tashkent Declaration (*full text*).

" The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan having met at Tashkent and having discussed the existing relations between India and Pakistan, hereby declare their firm resolve to restore moral and peaceful relations between their countries and to promote understanding and friendly relations between their countries and to promote understanding and friendly relations between their peoples. They consider the attainment of these objectives of vital importance for the welfare of the 600 million people of Pakistan and India.

I. " The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan agree that both sides will exert all efforts to create good neighbourly relations between India and Pakistan in accordance with the United Nations Charter. They reaffirm their obligation under the Charter, not to have recourse to force and to settle their disputes through peaceful means.

" They considered that the interests of peace in the region and particularly in the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent and, indeed, the interest of the people of India and Pakistan were not served by the continuance of the tension between the two countries. It is against this background that Jammu and Kashmir was discussed, and each of the sides put forth its respective position.

II. The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed that all armed personnel of the two countries shall be withdrawn, not later than February 25, 1966 to the positions they held prior to August 5, 1965, and both sides shall observe the cease-fire terms on the cease-fire-line.

exodus of people. They further agreed to discuss the terms of Tashkent Declaration, of the property and assets taken over by either side in connection with the conflict.

IX. The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed that the sides will continue meetings both at the highest and at other levels, on matters of direct concern to both countries. Both sides have recognised the need to set up joint Indian-Pakistani bodies which will report to their Governments in order to decide what further steps should be taken.

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan, record their feelings of deep appreciation and gratitude to the leaders of the Soviet Union, the Soviet Government and personally to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR for their constructive, friendly, and noble part in bringing about the present meeting which has resulted in mutually satisfactory results. They also express to the Government and friendly people of Uzbekistan, their sincere thankfulness for their overwhelming reception and generous hospitality.

Prime Minister of India : Lal Bahadur Shastri.

President of Pakistan : Mohammad Ayub Khan.

Kashmir not an integral part of India. The Indian Government had forwarded an intimation to the United Nations on October 14, 1966 that Kashmir was an "Integral Part of India".

This naturally can have no effect on the United States which recognises Kashmir as a disputed territory.

In fact, the United Nations itself is committed to resolving the Kashmir dispute between Pakistan and India in accordance with the wishes of the Kashmiri people.

The various documents and numerous maps issued by the United Nations show Jammu and Kashmir as disputed territory, and India can mislead no one by making such irresponsible statements.

All the 119 delegations, including India, attending the General Assembly were aware of the presence of a United Nations Military observers group in Kashmir, ever since the cease-fire in 1948 without any exception all U. N. members also show the cost of maintenance of this group to preserve the sanctity of the cease-fire as long as the dispute is not resolved peacefully.

Besides the political observers said that India should shake off her delusion that with the passage of time Pakistan's determined stand on Kashmir would wave and that by force of arms and weight of oppression, the spirit of the Kashmiris would be crushed.

They all recalled in this connection the statement of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan at the United Nations that oppression can succeed no more in Jammu and Kashmir, than in other parts of the world where the people struggle for freedom from alien domination.

India has, continuously repudiated every means of settlement, refused to engage in a purposeful dialogue and deliberately rejects the procedure and possibilities of a peaceful settlement.

Pakistan Accepted Cease-fire. On September 23 from 3 A. M. Ex-President Ayub in a special broadcast to the nation announced that while accepting the cease-fire in the interest of world peace, Pakistan would keep its forces in their existing battle positions for the time being.

President Ayub said : "World Powers have given us firm assurance of their awareness of the gravity of the Kashmir dispute and of the urgency to resolve it. If they fail in this, this continent will again be engulfed in a much wider conflict. The United Nations is on trial."

Paying glowing tributes to the skill and valour of the Armed Forces, the Ex-President remarked : "By his faith in Allah and in his cause and by his indomitable courage and superb craftsmanship the fighting man of Pakistan has written in his blood a golden chapter in the history of Islam.

Indian myth shattered. Pakistan had not only been saved but also the myth of India's armed might had been shattered. The whole world had come to acknowledge the just and moral basis of Pakistan's struggle which she fought for the right of self-determination of a people.

Ex-President Ayub warned the Nation to be vigilant. "Let us mention our Unity and our Resolve. Let us not forget for a moment that the struggle is not yet over. Let every one in East and West Pakistan remain prepared and vigilant. I am deeply conscious of your feelings but we must do nothing to disturb the image of a united and disciplined nation which you have presented to the whole world. The world cannot resist the moral forces which you have released. And the goal, though it might appear distant, is nearer than ever before."

Resolution inadequate and unsatisfactory. The Ex-President said that he had taken this decision in the interest of world peace although the Security Council's resolution of September 20, 1965 was both "inadequate and unsatisfactory." He added that Pakistan had received firm assurances from World Powers of their awareness of the gravity of the Kashmir situation and the need of taking concrete steps to solve it.

Pakistan was aware of the general inadequacy of the resolution passed by the Security Council, but it was a great step towards reopening the issue and making an effort to find its solution.

The resolution is regarded as a " vital stage in the achievement of a peaceful solution of Kashmir." The continuance of the armies of the two countries in battle position would provide a sense of urgency and there would be no excuse that sufficient time had passed to blur either the promises or the issue itself.

The draft regretting the delay in the full achievement of a complete and effective cease-fire, and a prompt withdrawal of personnel to Aug. 5 positions called in the Security Council resolutions of September 4, 6, 20 and 27, 1965: (Numbers 209, 210, 211 and 214).

1. Reaffirms its resolution of September 20, 1965 number 211 in all its parts;

2. Requests India and Pakistan to co-operate towards a full implementation of Paragraph One of the resolution of September 20, 1965, calls upon them to instruct their armed personnel to co-operate with the United Nations and cease all military activity and insists that there be an end to violations of the cease-fire;

3. Demands the prompt and unconditional execution of the proposal already agreed to in principle by the Governments of India and Pakistan for a meeting of their representatives with suitable representatives of the Secretary-General, appointed without delay after consultations with both parties, for the formulation of an agreed plan and schedule for the withdrawals by both parties, and urges that such a meeting shall take place as soon as possible and that such a plan contains a time limit on its implementation, and requests the Secretary-General to report on the progress in this respect within three weeks of the adoption of this resolution:

4. Requests the Secretary-General to submit for its consideration as soon as possible a report on compliance with this resolution.

Step forward in Kashmir Solution. The Pakistan Foreign Minister, told a press conference at Rawalpindi on October 11, 1965 that the recent resolution of the Security Council was a step forward towards the settlement of the Kashmir dispute.

He said that although the resolution was merely a reaffirmation of the earlier resolution of September 20, 1965, Pakistan was satisfied with its adoption, as the Security Council had reiterated all the parts of the previous resolution despite India's bitter opposition.

CHAPTER 9

AL-MUJAHID TEHRIK FOR LIBERATION OF KASHMIR

The people of Azad Kashmir has started *Al-Mujahid Tehrik* for the liberation of their motherland. They have been disgusted for more than two decades at the hands of American-controlled United Nations for the solution of their homeland. They have known the step-motherly treatment of the United Nations for solving the Kashmir tangle according to its resolutions of 1947 and 1948. When the United Nations had found in the Kashmiris' War of Liberation of September 1965 that the Kashmiri *Mujahids* were defeating and subjugating the coward Indian armies in Jammu and Kashmir, then the partial United Nations had stepped forward to rescue the Indians, and had in no time arranged for a cease-fire and had pressed the brave Kashmiris to quit all the conquered territory of Jammu and Kashmir. In its resolution of September 20, 1965, the United Nations had once again pledged to settle the Kashmir question according to the wishes of the people *i. e.* plebiscite. But then, as usual, the United Nations slept away over the question and practically instigated the India to declare it as "its integral part."

Furthermore, the practical career of the "so-called" United Nations in the case of Palestine was also before them. In spite of its resolutions for the withdrawal of the aggressive Israeli forces from the usurped Arab lands, there was no practical step towards it. The Kashmiri Muslims have seen that at last, the Palestinian Muslims, too, being weary, for a long period of 22 years, from the inaction of the United Nations, were now on the road to

liberation, by standing on their own feet, and pinning their faith in nothing else than Allah alone. The Kashmiris have also noticed the one-sided action of the American-backed United Nations in the cases of Cyprus, Sabah, and the Muslim Middle East countries, etc.

Thus partiality of the United Nations, have disgusted the Muslims of Kashmir. So they did not rely except their own power. For this purpose they founded *Al-Mujahid* force in Azad Kashmir for the liberation of their country.

The Kashmiri Muslims had also found all along, that the Indian Government had let loose a reign of terror and repression in their Valley. The Muslims were perpetually rounded up on one pretex or the other and locked up in interrogation camps for physical torture.

Almujahid's role for Liberation of Kashmir. Sardar Abdul Qayyum Khan, a Kashmiri Leader, said that his *Al-Mujahid Tehrik* would render "solid and effective" help to the freedom struggle in Occupied Kashmir in the near future.

He was speaking at the inauguration of the Central Office of the *Tehrik* in satellite town.

The movement was launched by the All-Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference headed by Sardar Abdul Qayyum Khan, in November last year.

Besides a large number of *Tehrik* workers from various parts of West Pakistan and Azad Kashmir, the ceremony was attended by two representatives of Al-Fatah, Arab Guerilla Organisation, and a contingent of Khaksars.

Sardar Qayyum said that the movement had received warm response from the people in Azad Kashmir and Pakistan.

He said *Al-Mujahid* councils had been set up in various cities in West Pakistan and Azad Kashmir and an *Al-Mujahid* fund had also been created.

The Kashmiri leader called upon the people to donate generously to the cause of liberation of Occupied Kashmir. Contributions to the *Al-Mujahid* Fund can be made to the fund accounts in the Muslim Commercial Bank and the Habib Bank.

Sardar Qayyum Khan said that the movement was absolutely non-political and that he had invited all parties in Pakistan and Azad Kashmir to join it.

He said that the *Tehrik* was, in fact, a movement for the completion of Pakistan which would be accomplished with the accession of the whole of Kashmir to Pakistan.

Past experience, he said, showed that India would never respond to any efforts for a peaceful settlement of Kashmir.

Earlier, Mr. Munir Khawaja, *Al-Fatah* representative, congratulated Kashmiri brethren on the launching of the *Al-Mujahid* Movement.

Jehad only way to settle Kashmir issue. The President of All-Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference and Chief of *Al-Mujahid* force said on April 13, 1970 that *Jehad* was the only way to settle the long-standing Kashmir dispute with India once for all, and the people who believed that this issue could be peacefully solved through political parleys or the United Nations were badly mistaken. He was touring the country for raising the *Al-Mujahid* force. He said that at least two lakh volunteers would be recruited to *Al-Mujahid* force. He had said that this sacred war had to be fought and won by the people of Kashmir and Pakistan themselves. He said that the Pakistan Government being under international pressure was unable to do much in this field.

United action required for liberation of Kashmir. A prominent Khaksar leader, on April 10, 1970, had called upon the "militant" movements of the country to reorientate their thinking and show complete unity in their action for the liberation of Held Kashmir.

He said that Kashmir could only be liberated through well concentrated efforts and practical struggle and not through issuing Press statements.

Another war over Kashmir inevitable. The President of the Muslim Conference, Sardar Abdul Qayyum, had said on April 29, 1969, while on his tour of Pakistan, at Bahawalpur that another war over the Kashmir dispute is inevitable between Pakistan and India.

Addressing the Bahawalpur Bar Association, he said it was now upto the people to decide whether this war should be fought on frontiers of the Punjab or at the feet of the Himalaya. He said that 'jehad' was the only solution of the Kashmir problem, as every other effort to settle the dispute had proved utter failure in the past.

Sardar Qayyum alleged that after 1949 Pakistan Governments attempted to suppress the Kashmir Liberation Movement and continued to bargain on the basis of give and take. He said that in order to liberate Kashmir a new movement *Al-Mujahid* had been launched and its branches were being established in all parts of Pakistan.

Kashmiris' right to be upheld. The President of Pakistan while at his State visit to Turkey on April 30, 1970 said at Ankara that the two vital disputes between Pakistan and India—Kashmir and Farakka—continued to vitiate the atmosphere.

Replying to a welcome speech by the President of Turkey at a dinner given for him, the Pakistan's President said that Pakistan wanted evolution of institutions to resolve disputes between nations. He said that " we have always stood by the sanctity of international agreements and commitments.

President Yahya Khan said : "We are firm in our resolve to uphold the right of the people of Kashmir, and are grateful for the unequivocal support given to their cause by the Government and people of Turkey".

Touching on the Cyprus issue, the President reaffirmed Pakistan's support to the Turkish Cypriots and said this

support was based on sound principles. He hoped that any negotiations that might take place between the Greek and the Turkish Cypriot communities would lead to fruitful settlement and would uphold the legitimate rights of the Turkish Cypriots.

Earlier, President of Turkey expressed his earnest hope that the Kashmir problem between India and Pakistan would be solved by taking "fully into consideration" the legitimate rights and interests of the people of Kashmir and in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations.

He said in all disputes Turkey had continued to be on the side of justice and equity.

The Middle East impasse also figured at the talks and the two sides emphasised that it should be solved in accordance with the United Nations Resolution of November 22, 1967.

The two Presidents also discussed matters relating to further mutual co-operation between the members of R C D.

Pak-Turkish talk's Communique. The text of the Joint Communique issued on May 5, 1970 at the end of President Yahya Khan's six-day State visit to Turkey included the issue of the troubled points of the Muslim world. The communique took up the "Indo-Pak disputes", the "Middle East issue" and the " Cyprus issue". The two Presidents also expressed their concern over the deteriorating condition in Cambodia and Vietnam.

Indo-Pak disputes. The President of Pakistan informed the Turkish statesman that no progress had taken place in the settlement of two basic disputes between Pakistan and India on Jammu and Kashmir and equitable distribution of the waters of the River Ganges. The two Presidents agreed that the Kashmir dispute should be settled peacefully, in conformity with the Resolutions of the United Nations. With regard to the distribution of the waters of the River Ganges, they agreed that this question should be

settled at an early date, on an equitable basis, through negotiations ensuring Pakistan's right.

The two Presidents expressed their conviction that their sincere and cordial talks, which were marked by broad identity of views, will constitute a new and important contribution to the strong friendship and genuine brotherly relations existing between Turkey and Pakistan.

Mid-East Issue. Expressing their grave concern about the rapidly deteriorating situation in the Middle East, which entails a serious threat to the peace and stability in the area the two Presidents emphasised the need for an early solution of the conflict on the basis of the Security Council Resolution of November 22, 1967, in the interest of a just and lasting peace. In this regard, they reaffirmed their opposition to the use of force as a means of securing territorial gains or political advantage, and called for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Occupied Arab territories in conformity with the Resolution of the United Nations Security Council. They also condemned the bombing of non-military targets and civilian population. In view of the importance of the Holy City of Jerusalem, which is revered by hundreds of millions of Muslims all over the world, the Presidents reaffirmed their belief that the unilateral measures designed to change the status of the Holy City cannot be accepted.

The President of the Republic of Turkey apprised the President of Pakistan of the recent developments in Cyprus. They agreed that the preservation of a peaceful atmosphere and security in the island are essential for the progress of the inter-communal talks. On the other hand, they reaffirmed the binding nature of the international agreements which have given rise to the independent Republic of Cyprus, and that any solution to the problem should be based on the commitments emanating from those agreements and the full respect of the communal status of the Turkish community as well as the legitimate rights and interests of all the parties involved.

Only force can dislodge India from Kashmir. The President of All-Jummu and Kashmir Muslim Conference, Sardar Abdul Qayyum Khan said on May 2, 1970 that the Kashmiri Muslims would not be cowed down by the reign of terror let loose by the Indian Army on the defenceless and innocent people of the held territory.

He said that unshakable determination and indomitable courage of the Kashmiris would force the Indians to bow before the wishes of the people and hold a free and fair plebiscite to ascertain the future of the State.

He said that the Kashmiris had been left with no alternative but to take up arms and launch the offensive against the occupied forces as all peaceful and amicable efforts had been frustrated by the Indian war-lords to solve the Kashmir dispute.

He declared that Kashmir would ultimately become a graveyard for the Indian forces who had been perpetuating untold miseries and committing brutal and barbarous oppression on the innocent and armless Muslims of Held Kashmir.

He said that it had been proved beyond any iota of doubt that the Indian leadership did not understand the language of peace.

He said that the Kashmiris did not require equipment or arms nor would they be supplied weapons by any Government to wage this holy war.

He said: "We depend on one factor on which we relied in the past thac was to snatch military hardware from Indians and use it against them."

This method, he said, was tried in 1948 and proved absolutely effective.

Al-Mujahid Movement, he said, was aimed at reviving the people's army to fight for their rights.

The President of the Azad Muslim Conference, Sardar Muhammad Ibrahim Khan said on May 2, 1970

that the Indian Government was trying to annex the Occupied Kashmir into India under a systematic and organised conspiracy but the people of Kashmir will frustrate her designs, at all cost.

He said, the heroic resistance being given by the Kashmiri leaders, Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah and Maulvi Farooq, etc., was an ample proof that the people of Kashmir would not surrender their sovereignty and would continue to fight the Indian imperialism at all fronts.

He said the Indians were mistaken if they thought that with the passage of time the people of Kashmir would start accepting the Indian domination.

Kashmir Issue took up at Izmir Summit. The President of Pakistan told the tripartite Izmir Summit on May 7, 1970 that the absence of a solution of the basic disputes of Kashmir and Farakka Barrage posed a serious threat to peace in the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent. He pointed out that there had been no progress towards a settlement on these delicate issues and the armies of India and Pakistan were facing each other.

The President regretted that the attitude of India on Kashmir and Farakka had been hardening although she continued to strike an attitude of reasonableness to hoodwink world opinion. He added that Pakistan was anxious to normalise her relations with India by reaching an honourable settlement of the basic disputes relating to Kashmir and Farakka. But India, even when approached at the highest level continued to stick to her position that the relations between the two countries could be normalised by taking up smaller disputes first.

Pakistan, however, believed that no improvement in relations was possible without settlement of the basic disputes. Therefore, the President regretted that he had no progress to report on Pakistan-India relation since Karachi Summit in December, 1968.

Farakka threat. The Pakistan President pointed out that by building Farakka Barrage India would deprive more

than 20 million people of East Pakistan Province of their means of livelihood and ruin the agricultural economy of that province.

President Yahya Khan said that since time immemorial Pakistan had been sharing the Ganges waters and she did not wish to go beyond exerting her right to continue to do so under the international law.

The Farakka issue, he added, was not only the economic issue but also a serious human problem.

"All we want is to secure our rights of equitable shares of Ganges waters without hurting India", the President said.

Discussion on Mid-East. The Middle East impasse dominated the four-hour opening session of the summit meeting of the Heads of States of Pakistan, Iran and Turkey.

A summit conference spokesman later said that the three Heads of State reviewed the international situation as it had developed since the last summit at Karachi.

He said there was a broad similarity of views on the Middle East question.

In this connection the situation following the summit at Rabat and the conference of Muslim Foreign Ministers at Jeddah was reviewed.

Asked about the situation arising from the alleged participation of Soviet pilots in Arab-Israel conflict the spokesman said all aspects of the problem came under review.

According to informed sources President Yahya Khan said at the summit that although there was comparative peace in Europe, the situation in the Middle East and South Asia was causing alarm.

The Pakistani President said the situation in Indo-Pakistan sub-continent had also deteriorated.

The President expressed his satisfaction over the harmonious and perfect understanding between the delegations of Iran, Pakistan and Turkey at Rabat and Jeddah.

General Review. The summit spokesman said that during the general review of world affairs topics like East-West relations and developments in Asia and Europe came up for discussion.

He said that President Sunay apprised the two leaders of the situation prevailing in Cyprus.

Conference sources said that the three Heads of State—Shahinshah of Iran, President Cevdet Sunay of Turkey and President Yahya Khan of Pakistan—emphasised the need for regular contacts among them in view of the rapidly changing world situation.

The conference began with a short opening address by President Sunay who welcomed the Shahinshah of Iran and President Yahya Khan and emphasised the need for continuing brotherly and close ties between the three countries.

RCD summit called for Kashmir settlement. The Heads of the RCD countries who assembled at Izmir on May 8, 1970 demanded settlement of Kashmir and Farakka disputes, the Middle East crisis and the Cyprus issue, etc.

Izmir summit joint communique which was issued on May 7, 1970 of the third tripartite summit of Iran, Pakistan and Turkey said that President Yahya gave an account of the state of Indo-Pakistan relations and reported that no progress had been achieved towards the settlement of two basic disputes between the two countries.

The final communique said : "The Shah of Iran and President of Turkey agreed that the Jammu and Kashmir dispute should be settled in accordance with United Nations resolutions. They further agreed that the dispute over the sharing of the Waters of the Ganges should be resolved at an early date on an equitable basis through negotiations safeguarding Pakistan's rights.

The Izmir Summit communique also expressed concern over the Middle East question, the three leaders said :

" It posed a serious threat to the stability of the region." They called for a solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The communique also demanded withdrawal of Israeli forces from Occupied Arab lands in accordance with the United Nations resolution of November 22, 1967.

On Cyprus, the leaders emphasised recognition of the partnership of the two communities and balance in accordance with international agreements giving rise to an independent republic of Cyprus.

The communique stressed for preservation of peace. They said, mutual co-operation and understanding among littoral States, without outside interference and with due regard to the legitimate rights of Iran was necessary.

The communique further said that positive steps should continuously be taken to further strengthen and deepen RCD collaboration.

The three Heads of States emphasised the need for settling international disputes by peaceful means. In an obvious reference to the developments in Cambodia, the communique said : " Deeply concerned with the situation in South-East Asia, they emphasised the need for avoiding further deterioration of the situation in the area and reiterated their hope for an early termination of the conflict in the region on the basis of 1954 General agreement."

Kashmiris' protest against genocide. Five Kashmiri Muslims were killed and about 50 persons injured, when the Army and police opened fire on the demonstrators in Held-Kashmir on May 14, 1970.

A wave of anger and hatred has spread throughout the Indian-held valley over the ruthless massacre of Muslims in different parts of India.

According to the reports received from across the cease-fire line, protest processions were taken out in the principal towns like Srinagar, Baramulla, Anantnaag and Shopian, The procession marched through the main bazars and raised

slogans : " Massacre of Muslims," Control Jan Sangh goondas," and " Chain Mahasabhai Dogs." At various places, the reports added, there was a clash between the processionists and the police and at other places the processionists were confronted with the army who had been called in to control the situation by puppet Sadiq Government.

The police and the army opened fire on the demonstrators which resulted in the death of five persons including two students and injuries to about 50 persons. The situation was worsening and was becoming beyond control, according to the report.

The freedom fighters had accelerated their activities as, according to them, if the Valley was not free from the clutches of Indian lords their life and property would not be safe and the Muslims would be either butchered or they would have to change their religion.

Acceleration of freedom movement. The President of Azad Kashmir said on May 14, 1970 that the Jammu and Kashmir Liberation League will not be prepared to consider any alternative solution except a plebiscite according to the United Nations resolutions to determine the future of Kashmir.

He added that there was no guarantee for the fact that any decision would be implemented by India, who after accepting the United Nations resolutions, had gone back upon her word.

He said that the people of Kashmir fully appreciated the sympathy and support to their cause expressed by the Turkish Government in statement during the visit of President of Pakistan.

The President said that the lessons of 1947 and 1965 should not be forgotten and the freedom movement should be properly organised by strengthening the political and by making a proper approach at the international level.

Iqbal's concept of Kashmir. Dr. Javed Iqbal, son of Iqbal said on "Iqbal Day" that Iqbal's concept of Pakistan was not complete without Kashmir's freedom and it was the bounden duty of every Pakistani to continue the struggle till the objective was achieved.

He added that Iqbal had immense love for Kashmir; adding that apart from being his homeland it was part of the ideological state which he had conceived for the Muslims of the sub-continent.

He disclosed that Allama Iqbal's entry into Kashmir was banned which few people knew. In 1937 he wished to pay a visit to Kashmir and entered into correspondence with the British Government of India for this purpose. By the time the bar was lifted the season to visit Kashmir was over and in early 1938, the great poet passed away.

He further said that Iqbal believed that the Muslim concept of a homeland was not confined to geographical frontiers of a country but was defined by the ideological boundaries.

Referring to the cultural onslaught which came in the wake of British rule, Dr. Javed Iqbal said that with the advent of British rule in the sub-continent Western thought and ideologies and different "isms" made inroads in the country. This development was readily accepted by the Hindus from time to time. Iqbal's thought, he added, proved the great defence against this onslaught. To him no country is a Muslim homeland unless Muslims in that country have the freedom to live according to the Islamic concept of life and ideology, he stressed.

It was, thus that the Holy Prophet (peace be upon Him) had to migrate to a place where he could fashion the society according to the divine concept.

Referring to the Pakistan movement he said that in our time the Sunnah was revived when the Quaid-e-Azam led an other great 'hijrat' of history after 1,400 years.

Dr. Javed Iqbal remarked that like all other ideologies

imported from the West secularism too had totally failed and the recurrent Muslim massacre in India during the past two decades proved its failure.

Dr. Javed Iqbal stressed that any social order that denied Allah and individual freedom was against the spirit of Islam.

Srinagar Convention. The six-day Srinagar Convention called by Sh. Muhammad Abdullah concluded on June 13, 1970. More than 270 delegates from various parts of the Occupied State of Jammu and Kashmir participated in the Convention. The Kashmiri leaders residing in Azad Kashmir and Pakistan had not been allowed by the Indian Government to attend the Convention.

The Convention was held to find out a just solution of the dispute. A resolution was passed, after discussions and deliberations, stressing the need for the immediate settlement of the issue hanging in balance for more than two decades in spite of United Nations decisions on it.

The resolution urged the delegates to bear in mind while evolving ways and means for the solution that it should be acceptable to all the parties to the dispute, including Pakistan.

The resolution expressed grave concern over the silence and indifference of the Indian Government towards the problem as if it did not exist. It further said that the Indian overlords must realise the fact that the problem did exist with all its serious consequences becoming more and more grave every day.

Sheikh Haji Muhammad Abdullah, who spent 14 years in Indian Jails addressing the last session of the Convention, said that the Convention had opened avenues for thinking through cross-currents of ideas on the matter about the plausible solution of the dispute. He said that the Kashmir issue was a threat to the peace and harmony of the whole sub-continent.

The *Sher-i-Kashmir* said that other conventions of the same nature would be held for the liberation of held Kashmir. He had also said that the Kashmiris will fight like their Algerians brethren for the liberation of their homeland from the clutches of the *Hindu Banias.*

The President of the Azad Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference, Sardar Muhammad Ibrahim Khan, on June 15, 1970 welcomed Sh. Muhammad Abdullah's declaration in the State people's convention in Srinagar that Kashmiris would fight for their freedom like Algerians.

He added that his Party had already declared to fight for the liberation of Kashmir on Algerian pattern and he was happy that an experienced personality like Haji Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah had supported the stand of his Party.

He assured Sheikh Abdullah that the people of Azad Kashmir and the Kashmiri refugees in Pakistan were prepared for such a struggle against Indian imperialism and were determined to make any sacrifice for this.

Sardar Ibrahim expressed his concern over the Jan Sangh plan to obliterate Muslims in Occupied Kashmir as pointed out by Sheikh Abdullah, and urged the Pakistan Government to take solid steps for the safety of Kashmiri Muslims.

He expressed the fear that under the cover of their so-called secularism, the Indian rulers would stage in Occupied Kashmir a drama similar to that of Maharashtra and Ahmedabad.

The Pakistan Government, he said, should draw the United Nations' attention to the latest Indian plan against Kashmiri Muslims and send Kashmiri leaders' delegations to foreign countries.

Azad Kashmir Minister for Agriculture and Works, declared that the people in Azad Kashmir would not watch as silent spectators the murder of their brethren across the cease-fire line.

He warned that the policy of annihilation of the Muslims and burning down of Muslim property pursued by the militant Hindu organisations was fraught with grave consequences and called upon the American-controlled United Nations in vain, to take immediate notice of this grave situation.

He paid tributes to Mir Waiz Farooq and other political leaders in Occupied Kashmir and expressed his conviction that their sacrifices and struggle would not end in vain. He added that the determined fight put up by the people in Occuped Kashmir was the clear indication that India would not succeed in prepetuating her hold on that area.

Pakistan supported Kashmir cause. The President of Pakistan while at his State visit to America and China in the months of October and November 1970 had supported the cause of Kashmir.

Interview in Newyark. The President of Pakistan, who arrived at Newyork on October 20,1970 to attend the 25th annivarsary commemorative session of the United Nations, at an interview had said that Kashmir was a live issue.

Asked when Kashmir was coming up before the world body he said the issue was still on the agenda of the United Nations Security Council and it was for the United Nations to resolve it.

Answering questions on United Nations itself, President Yahya called for rededication of the pledge made 25 years ago to uphold the principles and objectives of the world body. With certain nations, he said, it had become customary to ignore and flout the United Nations resolutions and added if solemn pledges made by nations or groups of nations were not adhered to or not followed the whole thing became futile.

President Yahya Khan said that members of the United Nations should either call it a day or make a new pledge to attain the principles we wish to attain.

President Yahya noted that 25 years ago nations together at San Francisco so that human beings could live in peace.

I personally don't think that we have lived up to it, he said. It has become an obsession to flout U.N. decisions. If that sort of thing goes on it becomes farcical.

The President added. We should all realise that laws are meant to be obeyed whether one likes it or not. It is time to rededicate ourselves to our pledge.

Answering questions, President Yahya said that as far as his Government was concerned the Kashmir question was always on the agenda of the world body. It is one of the many problems of the world which are hanging in the air. That is what I meant by saying that the U.N. is not getting down to it, he added.

At a session of the Uni ed Nations on October 22,1970 the Pakistan President had said that the dispute concerning Jammu and Kashmir has twice led to armed conflict. I often ask myself : "is this dispute so interactable as to dash all our hopes for its settlement"? What an immense contribution to world peace and progress could be made by the 650 million people of our two countries if only we could achieve an honourable and just solution of our outstanding problems. Is there any doubt that humanity would hail a Kashmir settlement on the basis of the principles of the Charter ? Despite the frustration of all efforts made so far to resolve the dispute, it is not too late to make a fresh move towards peace.

"On the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, I take the opportunity to make an offer to India. Let us move towdrs peace by holding discussions about the withdrawal of the forces of both

India and Pakistan from Kashmir so that its people are enabled to decide their future without any constraint or coercion from outside.

"Regarding the equally grave problem created by the construction of the Farakka Barrage on the international river the Ganges, I cannot imagine why it should be allowed to become explosive when all it requires is mutual good faith and the application if international law. Pakistan has been deeply concerned with many international issues which, at one time or another, have engaged the attention of the United Nations.

The President of Pakistan while at his American tour in Washingtt on October 26, 1970 had a meeting with the American President. He referred to his offer to India to resolve the Kashmir dispute.

While at his five-day State visit to China, the President of Pakistan had a meeting with the Premier of China on November 11,1970 at Peking. The two leaders reviewed the world situation, bilateral relations and major international issues—particulary the Middle East, Indo-China and Kashmir. In a joint Yahya-Chon communique on November 14,1970 at Peking, China reiterated firm support to Pakistan against foreign interference as well as outside aggression and supported the Kashmiri's just struggle for the right of self-deteremination.

China noted with interest Pakistan President's offer to India for withdrawal of troops from Kashmir with a view to enabling the people of the State to freely exercise the right of self determination as worthy of support by various countries.

Shaikh Muhammad Abdulla, and the Kashmiri

masses were very thankful to Pakistan's president for supporting their cause at various levels in the world at his recent State visits to America, China, etc. They were also thankful to China who was distinctly supporting their cause of self-determination.

Sh. Abdullah's Unity call to Kashmiris. Shaikh Muhammad Abdullah had said on October 7,1970 that India, which Chain's to be a friend of the Sate President Abdul Nasser, has brought a slur on the noble mission of the late President Abdul Nasser had initiated and stood for, by denying the right of self-determination to the Kashmiris.

He said the lesson the late Nasser had given to his nation to remain pitted against heavy odds, had awakened the oppressed nations to rise in rebellion and secure their rights of self-determination.

He was fully confident that the Kashmiris, with their grim determination and resolute effort, would give a death blow to the Indian plans of devouring the Valley.

The support of the masses had always helped the leadership in shaping the destiny of the nation, he declared while addressing a massive public meeting held to pay homage to the late President Nasser at Srinagar recently.

He said that the late Nasser's historic decision nationalising the Suez Canal drove the last nail in the coffin of imperialism in that part of the world. He hoped that the Kashmiris, too, in keeping with this glorious example of their Egyptian brethren, would liquidate the traces of Indian imperialist rule from the Valley.

He said that under the late Nasser's dynamic and prudent leadership Egypt withstood numerous difficult situations and accomplished gigantic tasks. The war against imperialism launched and carried through vigorously by the late Nasser had enhanced the image of Egypt in the comity of nations. The late Nasser got many things done by virtue of his unshakable determination, he said.

India, he continued, which had sunk crores of rupees in a frenzy of continued forcible and illegal rule on the Valley, was disappointed with the outcome because of the fact that the Kashmiris could not be enslaved. They were struggling to throw off the yoke of slavery, he said.

India, he said, had been resorting to the most wicked and ignoble tacties to maintain her hold on the Valley. Despite all that the Kashmiris were more determined then ever to carry out their ideal of wresting independence from Indian hegemoney.

He observed that the late Abdul Nasser had remained in power for nearly two decades and during this period he never cared for personal and family welfare or betterment, but instead kept his heart set on the sublime national goal which he himself had determined for Egypt. He worked for the uplift and welfare of his masses indefatiguably, treating all alike.

Through devoted and singleminded service to his country and the nation and through his sincerity of purpose and determination to achieve the glorious destiny, the late Nasser gained the confidence of his nation and led his people to success.

He said the Kashmiris were also courting trials and tribulations in an effort to liberate their homeland. Though

they were unarmed, they were hopeful of foiling Indian designs of keeping her stranglehold on the Valley.

He hoped that like the Egyptians, who stood behind the late Nasser like one man, the Kashmiris would forge unity in their ranks to throw off the yoke of Indian imperialism.

Indian action against Kashmiri students resented. The Lion of Kashmir, Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, had bitterly criticised the action against Muslim students in the Valley and had described it as an inhuman attempt to stifle the liberation movement intellectually.

Addressing the Councillors meeting at Srinagar he said that the puppet regime had withheld the stipends of 43 students of the Engineering College of Srinagar and had rusticated 757 degree students of various colleges of the Valley.

This was being done at the instance of the Indian Government, who, he said, had decided to intimidate the students. He said that the liberation movement was passing through a very crucial stage and the inhuman tactics resorted to by the Indian Government to curb the Kashmiri youths would result in disaster.

Sheikh Abdullah also condemned the puppet Government for confiscating the properties attached to three mosques and seven shrines at Anantnagar. This created wide spread resentment among the Muslims who were observing strikes throughout the Valley condemning this derogatory action. This was a servious interference into the Muslims religious affairs, he added. These nefarious methods adopted by the Indian Government, he

continued, were calculated to curb the Muslims, who were uniting their forces. The long oppressed Kashmiris were sure to achieve freedom provided they continued to support the national movement, which has been struggling to shap their destiny, he added.